CANCELLED

A.D.WOODHOUSE
BOOKSELLER

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/catholicismcriti0000pere

CATHOLICISM
AND
CRITICISM

BY

PÈRE ETIENNE HUGUENY, O.P.

Sometime Professor in The École Biblique, Jerusalem

TRANSLATED FROM
THE FOURTH FRENCH EDITION

BY

Father STANISLAUS M. HOGAN, O.P.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, TORONTO
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1922

(Printed in India)

34
214a

Imprimatur

ROBERTUS G. SPENCE, O.P.,

Archiepiscopus Adelaidensis.

Imprimatur

Fr. J. P. DOWLING, O.P.,

Prior Provincialis Hiberniae.

Fr. INNOCENTIUS de DOYLE, O.P., B.A.,

Censor Deputatus.

Nihil Obstat

Fr. H. M. DONEGAN, O.P., S.T.M.

Fr. P. P. McKENNA, O.P., S.T.M.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE following translation of the first volume of "Critique et Catholique" by a distinguished Professor in the Dominican Biblical School at Jerusalem has been made with the Author's cordial permission from the fourth French Edition. With the exception of two or three notes, the work is given in its entirety, while the translator has added a few notes which, he hopes, will not be without value. The work has been well received in France, and we venture to think that it will appeal to educated English readers, now especially that the events and trials of the past few years have turned so many hearts to God, and have made so many more seek in Catholicism the rest, peace and certainty they desired but had not found elsewhere.

The translator desires to express his thanks to Father Reginald Walsh, O.P., S.T.M., for having so kindly supplied the latest statistics in reference to the Orthodox Churches of Constantinople and Russia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction.

We believe because we have solid reasons for our belief (Apologetics), and our belief is not contrary to reason (Apology for Dogma).

First Part.

Apologetics.

(1) Object; (2) Method; (3) Divisions.

Chapter I.

The Christ-fact.

(4) The Creed of Rationalism; (5) Put to the Test by the Inexplicable Marvel of the Christ-fact; (6) Our Historical Documents and their Dates; (7) St. Paul and the Divine Sonship of Jesus; (8) The Witness of the Synoptics; (9) The first discourses in the Acts of the Apostles; (10) The Confession of St. Stephen; (11) The Testimony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin; (12) The Resurrection: St. Paul's Account of the Witnesses to it; (13) The Account in the Synoptics; (14) The Empty Tomb and the Hypothesis of a Common Pit; (15) The Resurrection and History; (16) The Genesis of Belief in the Resurrection according to M. Guignebert; (17) and M. Loisy; (18) Christ is Truly Risen; is the authoritative Prophet; and Son of God as no Creature could possibly be.

Chapter II.

The Jewish-fact.

(19) The *Diaspora;* (20) The Jewish-fact Minimised; (21) The Unique Case of Jewish Monotheism; (22) Cannot be Explained by Natural Means; (23) The Singular Hope of the Jewish Race; (24) The Prophecies; (25) Plato's Just Man; (26) The Poem of Isaiah on the Servant of Jhahve; (27) Its Undeniable Character of Messianic Prophecy; (28) First Reason for the Obscurity of Prophecy; (29) Second Reason; (30) Light Brought by Jesus; (31) The Blindness of the Majority of the Jewish People and its Consequences.

CHAPTER III.

The Catholic Consciousness of Primitive Christianity.

(32) Neither Dogmas, Ritual, nor Church? (33) Has Jesus Condemned all Ecclesiastical Authority; (34) The Primacy of Peter in the Acts and at the Council of Jerusalem; (35) The Rule of Faith and the Unity of the Church; (36) "Thou Art Peter"; (37) The Catholic Consciousness of the First Christians.

CHAPTER IV.

Jesus and the Church.

(38) Objection—Jesus did not Intend to Establish a Church; (39) Answer—Manifold Assertions of the Gospel. Jesus Calls All Men to be Saved. (40) The Kingdom of God and its Different Significations; (41) New Scheme of Salvation; (42) Separation from the Synagogue; (43) Jesus Appoints Himself Head and Entrusts the Work to New Workers; (44) Impossibility of Passing over so many Assertions which could not have been Inventions; (45) Why the Apostles did not Immediately set about Evangelizing the Gentiles; (46) The Expectation of the *Parousia;* (47) The Coming of the Son of Man.

CHAPTER V.

The Conversion of St. Paul.

(48) The Fact. (49) The Value of St. Paul's Testimony. (50) The Psychological Hypothesis of a Progressive Conversion. (51) Renan's Attempt at the Naturalistic Explanation. (52) The Admissions of Rationalists.

CHAPTER VI.

The Conversion of the Roman Empire.

(53) Facilities Afforded by Providence for the Spread of Christianity and the Obstacles; (54) Opposition of the People; (55) Paganism and the Life of the Ancients; (56) Opposition of the Cultured Classes; (57) Opposition of Imperial Power; (58) Was Persecution a Cause of the Development? (59) The True Cause of the Rapid Growth of Christianity.

CHAPTER VII.

The Church and Primitive Sects.

(60) Dangers Arising from the Primitive Sects; (61) The Law of Salvation; (62) Episcopacy necessary for the Church; (63) Necessity of a Central Authority; (64) The

Primacy of Rome. St. Clement's Testimony; (65) The Testimony of St. Ignatius of Antioch; (66) The Witness of Fact; (67) St. Victor and the Easter Controversy; (68) The Exercise of the Primacy is Restricted; (69) The "Real Miracle of Primitive Christianity" according to Renan.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Church and the Churches.

(70) Where was Catholic Unity to be Found in the First Centuries? (71) Protestant Disintegration; (72) Union in "Liberty"; (73) Self-worship of Liberal Protestantism, the Logical Outcome of Lutheran Principles; (74) The Anglican Church; (75) Its Divisions; (76) Eastern Churches; the Increasing Authority of the "Great Church" of the "Basileus" Led to Schism; (77) Decline of this Church: the Autocephalic Churches; (78) The Result of their Union; (79) Dogmatic Differences; (80) The Danger in the Future; (81) The Catholic Church.

CHAPTER IX.

The Church and Universalist Religions.

(82) Buddhism; (83) Its Growth and the Reason; (84) Islamism; (85) Its Success; (86) Compared with that of Catholicism.

CHAPTER X.

The Church and the World.

(87) Objection: Why are there so many non-Catholics; (88) "Outside the Church there is no Salvation": its Meaning; (89) The Elements of Catholic Belief; (90) To be Found amongst many non-Catholics; (91) To what the Facilities for Salvation are Compared; (92) The Sin against the Holy Ghost; (93) Answer to the Objection: Degrees of Supernatural Life; (94) The Church "the Salt of the Earth."

CHAPTER XI.

The Church and Sanctity.

(95) The Church on Earth is not without Blemish: its Hallowing Influence Affects even Sinners; (96) Fruits of Sanctity Outside the body of the Church; (97) The Superior Sanctity of the Catholic Church is Confirmed by the Uncompromising Firmness of her Dogmatic and Moral Teaching; (98) By a Comparison of the Heroic Virtue of her Saints with the

Moral Inferiority of Promoters of Schism and Heresy; (99) By the practice of the Evangelical counsels; (100) By the Superiority of her Devotedness as Shown in her Apostolate; (101) By the Excellence of Conversions to Catholicism; (102) The Moral Influence of Christianity. Morality of Pagan Civilisations; (103) Failure of Philosophy to give a Higher Tone of Morality; (104) Success of Christianity. The Martyrs; (105) Personal Devotedness in the Service of the Poor and the Outcast; (106) Moral Progress Inseparable from Christianity; (107) Deterioration of Non-Christian France; (108) Intense Moral Vitality of Catholic France.

CHAPTER XII.

The Church and Miracles.

(109) Confidence of the Primitive Church in the Argument from Miracles; (110) Miracles Prove Nothing to the Unbeliever: They do not Exist for Him; (111) Renan's Challenge; (112) Lourdes the Reply to it, Pierre de Rudder; (113) Marie Lemarchand; (114) Gabriel Gargam; (115) Short Statistics; (116) Miracles can no Longer be Denied *à priori;* (117) Protestantism and the Miraculous; (119) The "Miracles" of Esculapius; (120) The Objection—"Unknown Forces"; (121) How the Supernatural Intervention of God is Recognized in the Miraculous; (122) Definition of a Miracle; (123) Its Apologetic Significance; (124) How it may be Withstood.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Act of Faith.

(125) Integral Apologetics. The two Facts, Internal and External; (126) Two Schools of Apologetics; (127) The Internal Fact according to Theology and Experience; (128) Tendencies which are the Basis of the Religious Instinct of Humanity; (129) Peculiar Attractiveness of Catholicism; (130) The Antipathy to which it gives Rise; (131) Some States of Soul. Intuitive Faith; (132) Unsettled Thinkers; (133) Supported by the Internal Fact; (134) Lost Through Intellectual Pride; (135) Twofold Revolt of Senses and Intelligence; (136) The Crisis of Youth; (137) The Unbeliever Satisfied; (138) Trials, and the First Steps towards Belief; (139) The Proofs for the Existence of God; (140) Examination and Recapitulation of the Motives for Belief; (141) Premature Conversion; (142) Conversion Consequent upon the Act of Faith.

Appendices.

I. Authenticity of the Acts of the Apostles, date of their composition and of the Synoptic Gospels.

II. The First Martyrs in Gaul.

III. The Eucharistic Miracle at Favernay, 1608.

Bibliographical Index.

CORRIGENDA.

Page iv, line 27, and *passim*, *for* Jhahve *read* Jahveh.
,, v, ,, 22, *for* the Naturalistic *read* a Naturalistic.
,, vi, ,, 12, *for* of the Great Church *read* in the Great Church.
,, 10, ,, 12, *for* was *read* were.
,, 17, ,, 4, *read* and to the Gentiles.
,, 21, ,, 33, *for* Agada der Tanniter *read* Agada der Tannaiten.
,, 21, ,, 43, *for* righ *read* right.
,, 25, ,, 40, *for* εφοβουντο *read* ἐφοβοῦντο.
,, 40, ,, 36, *for* aprês *read* après.
,, 41, ,, 44, *for* prophétes *read* prophètes.
,, 44, ,, 24, *for* It is *read* Is it.
,, 44, ,, 27, *after* Israel *add* Note of Interrogation.
,, 47, ,, 2, *after* cause ? *add* reference 1.
,, 47, ,, 30, *for* Dillman *read* Dillmann.
,, 56, ,, 22, *for* μετὰνοια *read* μετάνοια.
,, 60, ,, 17, *for* κατακυρι εὐουσιν *read* κατακυριεύουσιν.
,, 60, ,, 18, *for* express *read* exercise: *for* κατεξουσιὰζουσιν *read* κατεξουσιάζουσιν.
,, 62, ,, 16, *for* Cesar *read* Cæsar.
,, 80, ,, 31, *for* expectance *read* expectation.
,, 80, ,, 39, *for* vd. *read* v.
,, 85, ,, 4, *for* the naturalistic *read* a naturalistic.
,, 96, ,, 25, *for* More-Aurêle *read* Marc-Aurèle.
,, 100, ,, 31, *for* Sybiline *read* Sibylline.
,, 101, ,, 37, *for* Jarhunderten *read* Jahrhunderten.
,, 102, ,, 17, *for* Neo-Platonicians *read* Neo-Platonists.
,, 102, ,, 18, *for* Jambilicus *read* Iamblichus.
,, 103, ,, 14, *for* religious *read* religions.
,, 105, ,, 5, *for* hinderance *read* hindrance.
,, 110, ,, 38, *for* Epitre *read* Epître.
,, 140, ,, 24, *for* Handlexicon *read* Handlexikon.
,, 151, ,, 25, *for* Abbè *read* Abbé.
,, 154, ,, 25, *for* un bête *read* une bête.
,, 163, ,, 26, *for* for *read* in.
,, 166, ,, 29, *for* Historie *read* Histoire.
,, 184, ,, 22, 23, *for* energizes . . . flows *read* energize . . . flow.
,, 193, ,, 39, *for* Christiamisme *read* Christianisme.
,, 196, ,, 14, *for* Poppoea *read* Poppaea.
,, 196, ,, 27, *for* araenam *read* arenam.
,, 200, ,, 15, *for* Church. *read* Church,.
,, 208, ,, 48, *for* Probléme *read* Problème.
,, 210, ,, 42, *for* parrie Pratigue Apologetigue *read* patrie Pratique Apologétique.
,, 211, ,, 19, *for* Rennaissance *read* Renaissance.
,, 222, ,, 37, *for* Courier *read* Courrier.
,, 226, ,, 30, *for* to *read* but.
,, 226, ,, 34, *for* Athénes *read* Athènes.
,, 229, ,, 7, *for* Cephalophorus *read* Cephalophorous.
,, 230, ,, 7, *for* as *read* like.
,, 243, ,, 39, *for* Mussalman *read* Mussulman.
,, 278, ,, 38, *for* Apótres *read* Apôtres.
,, 280, ,, 22, and line 30 *for* απαξ *read* ἅπαξ.
,, 291, ,, 31, *for* when *read* after being.
,, 314, ,, 2, *for* Procés-verbal *read* Procès-Verbal.
,, 315, ,, 39, *for* Procés-verbal *read* Procès-Verbal, and line 40 *for* copiest *read* copyist.

CATHOLICISM AND CRITICISM.

Can a Catholic be discriminating? The question is somewhat delicate, especially for those who attempt to think for themselves. M. Guignebert and others of his school tell us that, "if we would preserve any vital religious belief, we must fling off the yoke of Roman dogmatism, for the desire to believe, to know, and, at the same time to think," is Utopian and unintelligible. Belief implies ignorance, at least of exegesis, whose conclusions are pitilessly destructive of a faith which unreasonably seeks to impose upon us a dogma that is contrary to reason.[1]

Let us be critical by all means. It is in the name of criticism that we ask: What is the value of such statements? Unbelievers profess to be absolutely certain of the destructive force of their scientific arguments. Why not let science destroy this Faith of ours quietly, without casting about for any other means than scientific argument to work its destruction?

Our opponents, however, need not be anxious in our regard. If, perchance, they have met some who find a difficulty in reconciling the demands of Faith with those of Science, we take leave to inform them that, the Catholic is always at liberty to seek and to find, in the serious study of exegesis, history, science, philosophy and theology, the two-fold

[1] *Modernisme et Tradition Catholique*, Paris, 1908. We have no intention of giving any explicit refutation of M. Guignebert's teachings. This has been already done in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*. (Fev. 15; Mars. 15, Avril 1, 15, 1908). But as his book lies before us, we shall take notice of, and reply to, his objections as we meet them.

satisfaction of being guided at one and the same time by Reason and by Faith; in a word, of being a discriminating Christian.

Far from believing unreasonably, we believe on reasons so strong, that the wonder is how anyone can profess to be critical in matters of belief yet remain unaffected by the nature of that divine communication which gives Catholic teaching the authority it undoubtedly possesses.

It will be our endeavour to make this clear in the following pages. We have given this volume the title of Apologetics, as it is a brief exposition of the motives for belief which our Faith commands. We hope to complete the study by an Apology for Dogma, in which we shall show that, however mysterious and controverted these dogmas may be, none are in opposition to the rational data of metaphysics, exegesis, history, or science.

When we have shown that we have every reason for giving our assent, and that we cannot appeal to any solid reason for withholding it, we shall be in a position to assert that, not only can the critic be a Catholic, but that the thinker who is fully alive to the guarantees of Catholic Dogma and all it implies, cannot refuse to believe it without ceasing to be a critic in the true sense. There can be no question of choice between Catholicism and Criticism.

CATHOLICISM AND CRITICISM.

APOLOGETICS.

Object, Method and Division.

1. "O my God, I believe whatever the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, because it is Thou Who hast said it, and Thy word is Truth."

Such is the simple profession of faith that the Catholic Church demands from her children. Is this profession critically justifiable? Is it true that the teaching of the Church is divine? that is, that it comes to us from God with the guarantee of His infallible truthfulness, by a supernatural act, distinct from the divine assistance which is implied in the natural evolution of humanity. We unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. This affirmation is the condition of our act of faith. The exclusive object of Apologetics [1] is to show that this affirmation is well founded, by proving, not indeed with absolute evidence but with moral certainty that the teaching of the Catholic Church is a divine teaching, divinely guaranteed.

Yet we ask, why this distinction between that which is evident and that which is only morally certain? An example will assist us to understand it. My father comes to tell me that he is almost ruined owing to the failure of his bank. I have immediate evidence that my father is present and speaking to me. I have immediate evidence, from his manner of speech that he is in the full possession of his reason;

[1] Father Gardeil, O.P., has rendered signal service to Apologetics by clearly distinguishing its special object from the various matters that are more or less foreign to it, and which find a place in our manuals of Apologetics. *La Crédibilité et l'Apologetique*, Liv. III, c. I. Paris, 1908.

nevertheless, I have no evidence that he speaks truly, and that his bank has failed. Of this I cannot be more than *morally certain*. These facts are not evident because the inviolable secrecy of the intimate decisions of free will and fickle judgment which regulate all human evidence, will not permit me *to demonstrate rigorously* that my father neither deceives me nor is himself deceived. On the other hand, my knowledge of his character, prudence, frankness and affection for me; the improbability of his having been deceived concerning a fact so easily verified and which is of supreme importance to him; the further improbability that he would deceive me by an untruth without other motive than a wish to give me pain, forbid me to doubt his word. It is clear I ought to believe that my father tells the truth and that his bank has failed, facts which, while they are *morally certain* are not evident to me. Indeed I have greater certitude concerning these facts than concerning many truths which can be fully demonstrated, but whose demonstration is somewhat complicated.[1]

Different from human testimony in which the element of fact either is, or may be evident, while its truthfulness is not evident, divine testimony on the contrary, is presented to us with a guarantee of veracity capable of being fully proved, and it is the fact itself of Revelation that is only *morally certain* to us and not absolutely evident.

[1] Moral certitude differs from absolute evidence and from probability. An evident affirmation is one whose contradictory is inconceivable. A probable affirmation is one whose contradictory possesses some show of truth. While the contradictory is conceivable in the case of moral certitude it is quite improbable. Doubt is therefore unreasonable but possible so long as the assent to a fact which is morally certain, involves consequences that are opposed to the intellectual or moral inclinations of the person to whom it is proposed. In order that the assent may be maintained against all possibility of doubt, some influence of the will upon the intellect is required, which makes such assent akin to an act of faith properly so called. Hence, early theologians in referring to the fact of Revelation, spoke of it is as being *evidently worthy of belief, the primal object of faith*, the while they showed that it is *morally certain*. For a more fully developed exposition of the views put forward in this Introduction, we refer our readers to the article on *L'Evidence de Crédibilité*, in the *Revue Thomiste*, Mai 1909

Was this fact evident to the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles? The question is a debated one which we shall not now consider. The majority of Thomistic theologians with Cajetan, and probably St. Thomas himself, give an affirmative answer. Yet great theologians such as Bannez, teach that absolute evidence of the supernatural character of a revelation, necessitates the Beatific Vision and is incompatible with faith.[1]

Without discussing the question, we may say that theologians of repute are unanimous in asserting that we do not catually possess any demonstration of the fact of revelation so rigorous, as to give us absolute scientific evidence, and manifest how intrinsic and transcendent is the interdependence between Catholic teaching and the Divine Will. This fact of revelation, while not more evident than the truthfulness of human testimony which, when given under exceptional circumstances forces us to assent, is, nevertheless, just as morally certain. And, as we must believe in such veracity on many occasions, though strictly speaking we cannot prove it, so also it is clear that, a reasonable man must believe, that the origin and teaching of the Catholic Church are supernatural, since the grounds for this belief, though they do not afford rigorous demonstration, are nevertheless so cogent and so insistent as to compel our assent.

2. The strict, metaphysical demonstration of the existence of God is scarcely necessary as a preliminary, to prove that, the divine origin and authority of the Catholic Church are truths which are morally certain. But such demonstration is forthcoming, and before concluding we shall have occasion

[1] Cajetan, *Comment Summae*, II" II" Q. clxxi art. 5, n. 2 and 5. St. Thomas *Sum Theol.* II" II "Q. v. art. 2. Bannez, *Comment. Summae*, la Pars Q. xxxii. art, I Dub, 2: II" II", Q. v. a, I. *Secundo conclusio. Evidentia articulorum fidei in testificante non potest esse simul cum* Sec. I. Franzelin. *De Traditione et Scriptura. De habitudine rationis humane ad divinam fidem.* c. iv. prop. 3.

to give it in broad outlines. Many Catholics, however, are not so convinced of it that it may not be useful to confirm it, and guarantee it. This may be done by an act of faith, or even by the consideration of those marvellous works which are so many signs of Revelation. In our Apologetics we presuppose no more than the natural tendency which urges a rational being to affirm, with a certain conviction, the existence of a Supreme Intelligence and Authority that is postulated by "being" itself, by motion, by the order of the universe, as well as by the deeply rooted convictions of our conscience. We address ourselves even to those who will hesitate regarding the value of these reasonable conclusions. But we do not seek to convince those who hold that the non-existence of God is a demonstrated fact, and that the idea and sentiment of religion is false, for the reason that we do not consider such men to be critical, since it is an opinion universally accepted by all critics, unbelievers and believers alike, that Atheism neither has been, nor can be, demonstrated. We write for all those who are still questioning the worth of their religious aspirations, and we hope that the facts we shall bring forward and examine, will make them at one and the same time, morally certain of the existence of God and of the divine authority of the Catholic Church.

The facts to which we make appeal are: Christ, His life and influence on the world; the fact of Judaism, a preparation for Christianity; the fact of Catholicism, the development and only authentic continuation of the work of Christ. We shall show that these facts imply a number of phenomena, in which we invariably discover the intervention of a free, intelligent Power beyond all known natural forces, and the affirmation that this Power is the God Whom our intelligence seeks, and Who reveals to us the manner in which He may be found. If this affirmation be false, then must we acknowledge that, to falsehood alone does the sovereignty of nature

belong, the power to work wonders, and to bring about a progress in human life which truth could never hope to achieve. If we draw back from such a conclusion, then must we acknowledge the existence of God, and the divine mission of men and institutions, which claim and wield in His name a power that is not merely unique, but which defies any likely explanation by natural forces known or imaginable. The phenomena of nature reveal the existence and authority of the Maker of the world: still more insistent, still more definite is the voice of supernatural phenomena which, far from upsetting the order of nature as some have said, are its renovation and perfection.

Throughout this apologetic study we shall say nothing of inspiration. This will cause no surprise to the Catholic student. M. Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity at the Sorbonne, must assuredly be very ignorant of Catholic teaching, and have preserved his Protestant mental outlook very strongly, ever to have imagined that any Catholic would dream of seeking the fundamental proof of Revelation in a demonstration of the inspired nature of the Scriptures.[1]

Inspiration is a dogma which is believed and defended, but which cannot be proved by natural reason. Its theological proof presupposes but does not precede faith. When appeal to the Scriptures is made in Apologetics, it is not their authority as divinely inspired writings which is invoked, but what may be theirs as human evidence.[2]

Certain apologists give to this human authority the same value their faith has taught them to give to the inspired writings. This is an error, not indeed

[1] *Modernisme et Tradition Catholique en France,* pp. 13-14, Paris, 1908.

[2] This refers to Apologetics properly so called, that is when there is question of giving an account of the reasonable basis of our faith. Nevertheless, when there is question of defending Catholic teaching, even the authority of the Church against dissenting Christians, who withal, accept the inspiration of Scripture, it is perfectly legitimate as it is usual to appeal to the divine authority of the inspired writings.

of principle but of practice which we shall strive to avoid. For this reason we shall not appeal to any exegetical statement which cannot be established independently of the guarantee of the authority of the Church: neither shall we make use of those data of Catholic exegesis, the rational proofs of which would demand too lengthy, or too technical an exposition. This procedure, it is true, will deprive us of valuable arguments; but since these arguments are not necessary for our conclusions, it is better not to encumber with them, a demonstration which aims at clearness and brevity.

3. The strictly logical division of our study would give us three chapters and a conclusion: but since the fact of Catholicism is more complex than the other two facts, *viz.*, the Christ-fact, and the Jewish-fact, we shall devote several chapters to its examination. Having shown how Christ proclaimed and revealed Himself to be the Son of God, the authoritative mouthpiece of His Father; how His work had been divinely prefigured, and the way prepared for it by Judaism, we shall show how the first disciples of Jesus were conscious from the beginning of being that Catholic Church which Jesus had willed, which was assured of His divine assistance for all time, and how this conviction of the first Christians which is also ours, is justified in regard to its first assertion by the words of Jesus preserved for us in the Gospel, and in regard to its second assertion, by all those marvellous phenomena which accompany and secure the life and development of the Church throughout the ages.

We shall conclude with an examination of the legitimacy and conditions of the Act of Faith.

CHAPTER I.

The Christ-fact.

4.—The Creed of Rationalism put to the test. 5.—The inexplicable marvel of the Christ-fact. 6.—Our historical documents and their dates. 7.—St. Paul and the Divine Sonship of Jesus. 8.—The testimony of the Synoptics. 9.—The first discourses in the Acts of the Apostles. 10.—The confession of St. Stephen. 11.—The testimony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. 12.—The Resurrection; St. Paul's account of the witnesses to it. 13.—The account in the Synoptics. 14.—The empty tomb, and the hypothesis of a common pit. 15.—The Resurrection and history. 16.—The genesis of belief in the Resurrection according to M. Guignebert; 17.—And M. Loisy. 18.—Christ is truly risen; is the authoritative Prophet; and Son of God as no creature could possibly be.

4. "Criticism is only permitted to enter the sanctuary in fetters," says M. Guignebert in reference to the wise restrictions which faith imposes upon rationalistic systems.[1] These restrictions are justified, however, once the divine character of Catholic dogma is recognised; since, if this dogma is infallibly true, it cannot be contradicted without error. And rationalistic criticism is itself encumbered with a creed, a dogma, and fetters! We are informed that it is impossible that an Intelligence distinct from the Cosmos, should modify the normal evolution of the natural forces which are its constituents. Whatever appears to contradict this principle, must be either denied *a priori*, or interpreted in such wise as will bring it under the common law. This is assuredly drastic. For, while both principle and law are indemonstrable except in the case of one who

[1] *Modernisme et Tradition Catholique en France*, p. 7. Paris, 1908.

possesses commensurate knowledge of Nature, the Absolute, and their possible relations, they are an utter stumbling-block to the Positivist who will accept only what can be verified by experiment. Yet both principle and law must be adhered to, even though adherence to them receives, it is acknowledged, a severe set-back from the facts of Christ and Christianity! However curtailed the data may be, the problem of Christ still remains a very real enigma to the creed of the unbeliever.

5. Even if it were true that the Christ-phenomenon was only to be understood according to the negative conclusions of historical criticism with all their restrictions, and that Christ was merely a reforming *Nabi*,[1] who was crucified for having striven to infuse the spirit of true piety into the ritualistic formalism of his countrymen; who preached the kingdom of his dreams; was held up to veneration by his disciples, and deified by those Gentile neophytes to whom such apotheoses were familiar, the phenomenon would nevertheless be strange and unparalleled. How explain the persistent enthusiasm of his disciples for him who, having promised them victory and a kingdom, died on a cross, left suffering to them as his legacy, and a death as shameful as his own? How can the action of those Greek neophytes be accounted for, when, having abandoned polytheism in disgust of idolatry, they hastened to adore a new idol, nay, to hold him up to the adoration of the Judeo-Christians, those zealots of Jhahve, the jealous God? And how can we explain the fact that this monstrous idolatry has become the centre around which the beneficent teachings of eighteen centuries have gathered in harmonious synthesis, and which, despite all opposition, inspires the sublimest loyalty and the most heroic virtues even in our own time?

[1] *Nabi*, a Jewish term for the prophets.

6. The conclusions of the best rationalistic criticism only increase the difficulties of the problem. Since we have decided to be brief, we shall not appeal to either the Pastoral, Johannine, or the Catholic Epistles, or to the Apocalypse; a lengthy discussion would be required in order that these writings might be appreciated at their true value as human historical documents. The Fourth Gospel, which according to M. Guignebert "portrays the life, physiognomy, and teaching of Jesus quite differently from the Synoptics, despite all the fevered efforts of theologians," [1] is considered by Harnack to be simply "an elucidated Matthew." [2] Harnack is right; but as this Gospel is also of later date—the end of the first century—we shall appeal only to the evidence afforded by the Acts of the Apostles, the Synoptics, and those Epistles of St. Paul which are accepted as authentic. And in order to eschew all discussion regarding dates, we accept Harnack's chronology. His authority in matters of historical criticism is universally recognized, while his liberal Protestantism cannot be suspected of partiality towards supernatural manifestations.[3]

According to the latest researches of this historian, the Acts of the Apostles (the work of St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, as is the Third Gospel also from his pen), were probably composed about 60 A.D., certainly before 80 A.D. They

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

[2] *Joannes....ein verklärter Matthäus ist.* Lucas der Arzt. C. IV. Leipzig, 1906, p. 118. In a note Harnack insists upon this title and explains it. "If we have called St. John an elucidated St. Matthew, because his aim also is didactic and apologetic, we may with equal justice call him an elucidated St. Mark and St. Luke, for he shares in the aims which dominate both these Evangelists. By means of the historic narrative he strives, like St. Mark, to show that Jesus is the Son of God, and, like St. Luke, to prove that He is the Saviour of the world, in opposition to the unbelieving Jews and the disciples of St. John the Baptist." (*Luke the Physician;* 2nd edition, p. 168, note.)

[3] We do not accept Harnack's authority blindly, and we shall point out the dates which we regard as doubtful. In Appendix I we shall give a *résumé* of the arguments by which Harnack supports his conclusions concerning the composition of the Synoptics. We would direct the reader's attention to the suggestive note in *Luke the Physician*, p. 7.

presuppose the composition of the Third Gospel which itself presupposes the composition of St. Mark's Gospel, and the *Logia*, or Sayings of Jesus, as the principal sources of the Gospel of St. Matthew. The great Pauline Epistles were written between 49 A.D., the date of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and 59 A.D., the latest date to which the Epistle to the Philippians can be referred.[1]

7. Christ was crucified about the year 30; what did St. Paul think of Him twenty years later? To Paul, Jesus is not merely a reforming *Nabi*; He is greater than all the prophets. Born of woman and truly man, He is the Son of God who existed before His temporal birth (Gal. iv. 4); Who descended from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47); had His part in creation (1 Cor. viii. 6); is not the son of God merely as the righteous are, but is God's own Son (Rom. viii. 32). He existed in the form of God long before He assumed human form; humbled Himself even to the death of the Cross, and merited that exaltation which has placed the Man born of woman at the right hand of God, making Him the Lord Jesus at whose Name every knee in heaven, on earth, and in hell shall bend, since this name is above every other name.

> "For let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus. Who being in the form of God (ὃς μορφῇ Θεοῦ), thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but emptied Himself (ἐκένωσεν), taking the form of a servant (μορφὴν δούλου) being made in the likeness of man, and in habit found as a man, He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the Cross. For

[1] *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, I. II. C. 1, Leipzig, 1897, T., p. 239. According to this work the Epistles to the Thessalonians were composed in 48 or 49; those to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans before 54; and the Epistle to the Philippians in 57-59.

> which cause God also hath exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above all names: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father." [1]

8. Was it the pagan custom of apotheosis that led Paul, a Pharisee, to defy Jesus? He tells us that his teaching was known to, and approved by, Peter, James, and John, as well as by those who were held in the highest esteem by the Church in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1-10). It is not surprising, then, to find side by side with the account of the Virgin-birth in the Synoptic Gospels,—which, be it said, is of Palestinian-Jewish origin, not Grecian,[2] other texts which assert that Jesus not only proclaimed Himself to be the Messiah, but that He believed Himself to be the Son of God in the precise,

[1] Phil. ii. 5-11. Of the two versions given for ἁρπαγμόν robbery, that of the Vulgate is more in keeping with the ordinarily active sense of derivatives in μος ; is upheld by the Latin Fathers with the exception of St. Hilary and St. Jerome; while it asserts the dogma more explicitly by affirming that our Lord could claim equality with God, yet not be a usurper.

The parallelism of the two expressions: *form of God* (μορφὴ Θεοῦ) and *form of a servant* (μορφὴ δούλου), has a very precise signification. The Apostle regards Jesus as truly God and truly man. "Since the form of a servant signifies human nature," says St. John Chrysostom, "so, form of God expresses divine nature." (*Hom. vi. on the Ep. to the Philip. P.G.*, vol. lxii., col. 220.) It is not only the fact that Christ was like other men by His nature that forces us to give this meaning to the term μορφὴ ; it is the meaning which habitually distinguishes it from the term σχῆμα. This latter term "indicates the *external configuration* in distinction to the substance which cannot be perceived by the senses, and μορφὴ the substantial form which, nevertheless, does not exclude the exteriorisation of that form; so that σχήμα is the variable, μορφὴ the permanent, unchanging element." J. Labourt, *Notes d'Exégèse sur Phil. I, 5-11*, in the *Revenue Biblique*, 1898, p. 406.

[2] "The legend of the Virgin-birth," says Harnack, "first vouched for by St. Matthew, arose on Jewish Christian soil, more particularly among the Christians of Jerusalem." (*Luke the Physician*, p. 167 note.) The peculiarly Aramaic style both of language and ideas testifies to this, in St. Luke especially. So much the worse for the explanation given by certain critics who insist that the account is merely a transcription of the legends of those mythical heroes, the offspring of the gods and human beings, watered down for the use of Gentile converts. Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

personal sense the Church has given to the term.[1] He sets Himself apart from His disciples and the rest of mankind. He says: My Father and Your Father; but while He recommends His disciples to say Our Father, He never makes use of that expression Himself. The prophets who preceded Him are God's servants; He is the natural heir, the son of the Master of the vineyard (St. Mark xii. 1-12). Between the Father and Him there is an absolutely unique and transcendent relationship of reciprocity and equality. And no one knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither doth any one know the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal him. (St. Matt. xi. 27; St. Luke x. 22).[2] Finally, the problem that engaged the attention of the Pharisees regarding the Christ as the Son yet Lord of David, has no meaning if Jesus did not believe that He was at once the Son of David and of a nature superior to his. (St. Matt. xxii. 44-46; St. Mark xii. 35-37; St. Luke xx. 41-44.)[3]

These texts testify that the primitive Judeo-Christian communities, whose beliefs have

[1] "Not a single word in the Synoptics," says Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 78), "allows us to suppose that, if Jesus called Himself the Messiah He was believed to be the Son of God in the precise, personal sense given to the term by the Church."

[2] St. Matt. xi. 27; St. Luke x. 32. "The Evangelist does not imply that God was not known as the Father before the coming of Jesus; he wishes it to be understood clearly that Christ the Son alone knows the Father perfectly, and this because He is the Son, just as God the Father alone knows the Son perfectly because He is the Father and God." Loisy. *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, p. 81.

We should remark that M. Loisy, who rejects Harnack's interpretation of this passage, does not admit that Jesus was conscious of His Divine Sonship, but regards as a traditional gloss this text upon which Harnack builds his theory of the Essence of Christianity, because he sees in it one of the most authentic pronouncements of Jesus.

[3] Tixeront. *La Théologie Anténicéenne.* C. II. Paris, 1950, p. 69. We fail to see how M. Guignebert can gather from these texts that Jesus "reproached the Scribes for having taught that the Messiah should be a descendant of David," *op. cit.*, p. 45. To ask the Scribes why they insisted that the Messiah should be the Son of David would have been rather foolish. They would have laughed at the ignorance of a prophet who was so poorly read in the Scriptures. *cf.*, Lepin. *Jesus, Messie et Fils de Dieu d'après les Evangiles Synoptiques*, Paris, 1907.

supplied the material for the Synoptics,[1] gave the attributes of God to Christ. This conclusion is historically valid. But was it not the very beliefs of these communities, influenced by St. Paul's teaching, that have given colour to the discourses attributed in the Catechesis to the Master? And if we would know what He really thought, must we not distinguish between what Jesus actually said and what tradition may have added?

It is not easy to make such a distinction. In attempting to do so we leave the domain of history and enter that of hypothesis, and the hypotheses are as numerous as there are commentators, whether orthodox or rationalistic, who judge according to temperament or preconceived opinions. The rationalist will find that, "amid so much obscurity, the surest conclusions are negative ones,"[2] because they are more in keeping with his own particular doctrine. The orthodox replies, and with reason, that we cannot refuse to attribute to Jesus those statements which testify to His Divinity merely because they are out of place in one who was only a *Nabi*.

9. It is urged that Peter at first did not believe in the Divinity of Christ since in his early discourses (Acts ii. 22-36; iii. 12-26), he represents Jesus as a man whom God made Lord and Christ in raising him from the dead. The objection is not so serious as it appears to be. Jesus was a man and a prophet as well as Son of God; and, before men could be asked to believe in His Divine Sonship on the strength of His own word, it was necessary that He should be recognized as prophet and Messiah. Peter was not quite so ingenious as some modern apologists. He did not attempt to propound the doctrine of Christ's

[1] "Our position is therefore unassailable when we assert that the whole Synoptic tradition belongs to Palestine and Jerusalem, and has had no connexion with Gentile Christian circles, except in the redaction of St. Luke." *Luke the Physician*, p. 166.

[2] Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

Divinity before he had proved the genuineness of Christ's mission. And though the Divinity of Christ is more than suggested in the passages mentioned—Jesus is called "author of life" (Acts iii. 15)—it is somewhat illogical to form an estimate of Peter's belief, or of his teaching to those who did believe in Christ, from a discourse that was delivered to unbelievers! Paul said no more in his discourse at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 17-41), but all men know what Paul thought of Christ.

In rising from the dead Jesus becomes "both Lord and Christ." Are we therefore to conclude that before His resurrection He was only a *Nabi*? By no means. The heir-apparent becomes king when he ascends the throne, but he is more than a simple subject before his accession. It would not have been usurpation, if, on His entrance into the world the Man-God had assumed the Kingship to which as "equal with God" (Philip ii. 6), He was entitled. But it was His Father's will that the Son should obey the law of κένωσις (*Ibid*, 7), renounce the glory that was His by right, and merit His kingdom and exaltation by a life and mission of penitence, and by a death on the Cross. This is the reason why Christ's life is but an anticipation of His kingdom. He does not wish to be called Messiah, though He is so really and reveals the fact to His intimate friends, not only because He fears to arouse the foolish enthusiasm of the populace who look for a warrior and statesman, but chiefly because He is only entitled to receive the honours and prerogatives attendant upon this dignity, after His death. M. Loisy's opinion is correct in this restricted sense. But before He was "predestinate the Son of God in power" (Rom. i. 4), Jesus was already the Son of God hidden and humiliated. This is the teaching of St. Paul; and St. John does not deny what he said of the Word, when he makes Christ proclaim on the eve of His death: The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified....Now is the judgment

of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself (xii. 23-33). Until then Jesus had only preached to the Jews; to the Gentiles by exception (St. Matt. x. 5; xv. 24), for His Messianic manifestation had only dawned. But when He had entered into His glory he empowered His disciples to work greater wonders than He had wrought (St. John xiv. 12-14), and sent them forth to all nations. Thus the apparent opposition which is seen in the Synoptics, between the universality of Christ's teaching in regard to the salvation of all men, and the exclusiveness of His own teaching, is easily reconciled.

It is, therefore, quite permissible to regard the testimony of the Synoptics as the expression of the beliefs of the primitive Christians and of the teaching of the Master. But this is only a negative conclusion. Can we go further, and, without appealing to the authority of the inspired writings, draw from history some positive manifestation of belief in the transcendence of Christ which is anterior to St. Paul? We can do so.

10. "The avenging stones" held in readiness to punish the insensate and blasphemous attempt of the man who should claim equality with God, or assert his divine sonship, were hurled at Stephen.[1]

Of what blasphemy had he been guilty? We learn what it was from the words which hastened his condemnation: "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." This was too much; and the Jews "crying out with a loud voice, stopped their ears, and with one accord ran violently upon him. And casting him

[1] "How could a Jew admit that He Whom he dared not name, and to describe Whom he would not attempt, would assume human nature? The mere suggestion of so unspeakable an hypothesis was a blasphemy that called for the avenging stones." Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

forth without the city, they stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man, whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying: Lord Jesus receive my spirit." (Acts vii. 55-60.)

Stephen commits his soul to Jesus as Jesus had commended His soul to God; the Jews, therefore, had understood him perfectly: he made Jesus equal to God. It was their horror of such apotheosis which they regarded as blasphemous, that brought persecution upon the entire community. Until then, the Pharisees who were the popular party, had tolerated the group of pious Jews who prayed in the name of the crucified and risen Jesus, and while thus believing in His Messianic character, had obtained astounding wonders. Nay, they had even defended them against the undying hatred of the Sadducees and the chief priests. The illusion was not dangerous; it could be safely left to the divine and infallible test of time (Acts iv. 21; v. 13-34; vi. 16). But the moment the followers of the Nazarene publicly made their Prophet equal with God, their cause was prejudged. This was idolatry. Jesus had been justly and rightly condemned as a blasphemer, and lo! His followers paraded the sacrilegeous impiety He had taught them. Saul, the disciple of the Pharisee Gamaliel who pleaded the cause of the Apostles before the Sanhedrin, will go forth to hunt down the Christians for his masters until the not far distant day arrives when, struck down on the road to Damascus, he makes the blasphemy of the dying Stephen his Credo, and proclaims the divine transcendence of Jesus.

Yet, as Harnack shows, we are still in the year of Christ's death or the year following. [1]

The faith of the community at the time it is true, knew nothing of the rigour of the Nicene formula "consubstantial," but is its testimony not sufficiently explicit? To the glorified Christ it gives the attributes

[1] *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur*, p. 237.

of God. The invocation of His name is the unique means of salvation (Acts iv. 12). He is not merely a holy or just man, He is the Holy One, the Just, the Author of Life (Acts iii. 14, 15). The Holy Spirit Who is the Spirit of God, is also His Spirit (Acts v. 3, 9) whom He pours forth upon all who invoke Him (Acts ii. 33). He gives "repentance and remission of sins" (v. 31); is "judge of the living and of the dead" (x. 42); enjoys with God the title of Lord (iv. 33; v. 9, 14), since, 'exalted by the right hand of God" He shares with Him both power and glory (ii. 35; vii. 58-59).

The Sonship, therefore, which unites Jesus to the Father is very different from that of the saints and prophets.

What is the precise significance of this Sonship? In what manner, and with what restrictions, is Christ subject to the Father? How distinguish in Him the human and divine? The faithful had only confused ideas on these points which would not be made clear for a long time. It may be that the absence of definite knowledge made conversion easier, and that previous to the startling confession of Stephen but little attention was paid to the new teaching by outsiders. But if this absence of precise knowledge lessen the difficulties of the psychological problem with which we are concerned, it does not suppress them.

How does it come to pass that Jews, whose reverence for the awful majesty of Jhahve was so profound, that they would not even dare to name Him, dared, nevertheless, to place beside Him and to endow with equal power, a Man who had been crucified? and to do this, be it remembered, not after a lapse of forty years but on the very morrow of His death?

They would never have dared to do so if the Crucified Himself had not established His claim to the position, and compelled the belief of men by rising from the tomb.

The alleged blasphemy for which Stephen was stoned had also been the motive for the condemnation of Jesus; the Synoptics assert this.

MATT. xxvi. 63-66.

"But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest said to him: I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be the Christ the Son of God. Jesus saith to him: Thou hast said it. Nevertheless I say to you, hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his garments, saying: He hath blasphemed; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now you have heard the blasphemy: what think you? But they answering, said: He is guilty of death.

MARK. xiv. 61-64.

But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the the high priest asked him, and said to him: Art thou the Christ the Son of the blessed God? And Jesus said to him: I am. And you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of God, and coming with the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rending his garments saith: What need we any further witnesses. You have heard the blasphemy. What think you? Who all condemned him to be guilty of death.

LUKE xxii. 66-70.

They brought him into their council, saying: If thou be the Christ tell us. And he saith to them: If I shall tell you, you will not believe me. And if I shall also ask you, you will not answer me, nor let me go. But hereafter the Son of Man shall be sitting on the right hand of the power of God. Then said all: Art thou then the Son of God? Who said: You say that I am. And they said: What need we any further testimony? for we ourselves have heard it from his own mouth.

Jesus was not condemned by Caiphas for having said: I am the Messiah. This demanded discussion, not condemnation without a trial. He was condemned for having asserted that the Messiah, Son of Man, should henceforth be seated on the right hand of God, thus affirming that He was the Son of God in a sense far different from that to which the just could lay claim.[1]

[1] In the *Revue Biblique*, October, p. 571, Pére Lagrange has the following commentary on the above texts.

"Between Matthew and Mark on the one hand, and Luke on the other, the divergence is sufficiently marked. The former give but one question which embraces at one and the same time the character of the Messiah and that of the Son of God; Jesus replies by a declaration which is taken to be affirmative on the two points.

"In Luke, He is asked if He is the Messiah, and He answers that He shall be 'be sitting on the right hand of the power of God.' He is regarded as having called Himself the Son of God, and He acknowledges this.

Therein lay the unthinkable and audacious pretention, the mere declaration of which was blasphemy in the eyes of the Jews: Then the high priest rending his garments saith: What need we any further witnesses? You have heard the blasphemy (Mark xiv. 63). "The avenging stones" were not flung there and then for Pilate was close at hand; but his permission was obtained for a crucifixion. And it was not only with malignant glee because their hatred was satisfied, but with intense satisfaction at having avenged the honour of Jhahve, that the Rabbis, "wagging their heads" cried out to the Crucified: "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross (Matt. xxvii. 40), while the Victim murmured in His agony: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do (Luke xxiii. 34). Jesus

"The divergence is concerned with two things: the allusion to Daniel vii. 13, and the order of the questions.

"In Mark and Matthew, Daniel is quoted almost literally. . . this is not so in Luke. . . .

"St. Luke appears to lay special stress upon the 'sitting' on the right hand of God—the power being only a formula that was meant to exclude too gross an anthropomorphism—a fact also noted by St. Mark and St. Matthew, but which at first sight seems to be wanting in Daniel, and is to be found in Psalm *cx.* 1: *Sede a dextris meis.* It is this 'sitting,' however, which solves the enigma propounded in Daniel's vision. In Daniel (vii. 9), 'thrones were placed' previous to the coming of 'one like the son of man,' and the question that exercised the Jewish rabbis was this: If one of these thrones was reserved for God, was another reserved for the Messiah who should be seated beside Him? Rabbi Aquiba unhesitatingly replied in the affirmative, but was reproved for doing so by José the Galilean, who exclaimed: 'Aquiba how long wilt thou profane the Glory?' (ap. Bacher. *Die agada der Tanniter.* t. 1., p. 355, note, 2.)

"Nothing could be more logical or clearer then, than Luke's order when this preoccupation of the Jews is taken into account. In Mark and Matthew the High Priest is regarded as knowing that 'Messiah' and 'Son of God' are synonymous. It might, nevertheless, be supposed that a man might assume the title of Messiah, yet make no attempt to claim to be the Son of God. It was necessary, therefore, to ask the accused if he claimed to be Messiah. Jesus replied in the affirmative, and in such wise as to let it be understood that this Messiah should be seated on the righ hand of God, and should also be on an equality with Him. According to Rabbinical teaching it was a profanation of the Glory to claim equality with God. Hence, the High Priest could not have asked: Art thou therefore God? which would have been blasphemy in his eyes; he could only ask the question he actually did: Art thou therefore the Son of God? This question could not be taken as meaning a man dear to God. So much was understood from the first question. When, therefore, Jesus answered in the affirmative His Cause was judged already. It is difficult to admit that Luke, having no other

died a Martyr, and the first, for the truth of His Divine Sonship. This, however, was not sufficient to establish the faith. He must rise from the dead.

12. The oldest documentary evidence of the Resurrection that we possess is contained in I Cor. xv. 3-19.

"For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. And that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures. And that He was seen by Cephas; and after that by the eleven. Then was He seen by more than five hundred brethren at once of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that, He was seen by James, then by all the apostles. And last of all He was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church

source than Mark, should himself have restored what is the probable order. Its probability is a guarantee of its truth. St. Luke follows the more exact tradition; the others have not done so.

"If Luke has preserved the juridical order, we may ask whether Mark and Matthew have not preserved the original colouring of Jesus' reply better? and if Luke has not deprived it of its character as an exact Scriptural quotation on account of his Gentile readers?

"It may be so, and we incline to this opinion. Yet, if one accepts the reading which most closely resembles Daniel as original, it must be understood in Daniel's sense, that is, in a symbolical sense.

"All that Jesus affirmed by these words of Daniel was that He was the Messiah dimly shadowed forth by Daniel, and that He was a Messiah who had the right to sit on the right hand of God, a right that Daniel left in complete obscurity. He did not tell the Sanhedrin that the heavens should be opened to them that they might behold the Son of Man in His glory. . .

"It was in this sense that the Sanhedrin understood Him. They saw in His reply, not the promise of a miraculous manifestation, which, perhaps, they would have ridiculed, but a declaration of principle; for this they condemned Him."

To this commentary we shall add a few words by way of reply to the objections against the historicity of the incident. It would be wrong to conclude that the Sanhedrin did not condemn the Accused on the religious question—which was all they cared about—before they decided to have Jesus condemned by Pilate as a disturber of the peace, merely because they themselves did not pass sentence in ratification of Pilate's verdict. While we admit that the apostles who fled were not, any more than the people of Jerusalem, in a position to know what took place in the Council of the Sanhedrin, it must nevertheless be remembered that, whatever may be the details, the decisive reason for holding this Council, *viz.*, the alleged blasphemy of Jesus, was too serious, and altogether too favourable to the Sanhedrin, to permit of it being withheld from the people. St. Luke, who does not make use of the word blasphemy, indicates the fact, and his text points to a similar decision arrived at for the same reason as we find in St. Matthew and St. Mark.

of God. . . so we preach, and so you have believed. Now if Christ be preached, that He arose again from the dead, how do some among you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God: because we have given false testimony against God, that He hath raised up Christ; whom He hath not raised up, if the dead rise not again. For if the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

The idea of a resurrection had already given offence to some of the first Grecian converts at Corinth. Without denying the resurrection of Christ they denied the resurrection of the dead in general. St. Paul told them that they were illogical. Then fearing that his appeal to them to be consistent might drive them to reject the truth they had hitherto preserved, he reminded them of the guarantees he had given for a fact, whose importance was supreme, since it was the foundation of Christian belief.

St. Paul's account is not a narrative. It is a summary of the evidence in favour of the Resurrection. He does not mention the holy women: a woman's testimony does not count in such a case, since according to St. Luke, they are too easily credited with being mere visionaries (xxiv. 11). Their testimony is accepted when it has been confirmed by other well attested facts; it has not the value of official evidence by itself. The Fourth Gospel also gives us to understand this for when the Evangelist enumerates the apparitions, Christ's appearance to Magdalene with which he began his narrative of the Resurrection, no longer finds a place (St. John xxi. 14).[1]

[1] This is the remark of W. J. Sparrow Simpson, in his article *The Resurrection of Christ*, in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. Edinburgh, 1908, p. 507.

13. While Paul does not mention the appearances to the holy women, the Synoptic Gospels, written some fifteen or twenty years later, dwell with marked satisfaction on them and on the various details connected with the discovery of the empty tomb, but are more reticent, and, to our way of thinking, less lavish of detail when referring to the facts mentioned by St. Paul. What is the reason for the change? The reason is that, whatever the apologetic character of the Gospels may be, they are not primarily a demonstration but a narrative of those events which most appealed to the faithful, and which, just because they were most frequently spoken of in the Catechesis, were consequently more faithfully preserved in the traditions of the different communities from which the Gospels originated and for which they were composed. The Apostles preached the Resurrection of Christ and gave their evidence for it after the manner of St. Paul in his Epistle, in which, as he tells us, he merely wrote what he had already preached. The first question asked by those whose conversion was sought, was: Did any persons see the Risen Christ? Who were they? Their interest in the difference and number of appearances which were all more or less alike, and in which our Lord repeated the same teachings to the different witnesses, was not so great after their conversion. What chiefly interested the converts of that day as of our own was the manner in which the Resurrection had occurred. When they could not learn this, or penetrate the mystery, they longed to hear the narrative of the first manifestations, to learn the ever living history of those few moments in which doubt, despair, and sorrow, the outcome of a love that was powerless to resuscitate the beloved, had been at once and for ever banished from the hearts of Christ's friends, by faith, hope, and overwhelming joy. How often had Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and others whose names are unknown, as well as Simon and John, to repeat the tale of that unforgettable moment! How

often too did the faithful relate what they had heard! And when we remember these things, need we find cause for surprise in the differences in detail of those journeys to and from the tomb that Easter morning? According to St. John and the closing verses of St. Mark,[1] Magdalene only was at the tomb, whereas the Synoptics tell us that the other holy women accompanied her. Mark represents these women as being dumb with fear, while the other Evangelists make them the joyful messengers of the Resurrection. Each version is correct. Magdalene went to the tomb with the other women; she also went alone. The holy women were at first so much afraid as to be tongue-tied, but when the moment of fear had passed and Magdalene had told her story, they could no longer restrain themselves, and time and again they told all they had seen and heard. Their hearers seized upon those details which most impressed them, and when their turn came to narrate what they had heard they gave prominence to these details without troubling about other circumstances which, in consequence, were left in the background. It is scarcely fair to find fault with, or accentuate these differences of, detail in the Gospels when the same thing occurs to our most authentic records. Discrepancies like these may give rise to objections against the inspiration of the sacred writings which we shall deal with in our Apology for the Dogmas of the Church. But such discrepancies only serve to confirm the authority of those writings as genuine human history. They prove that the narratives of the discovery of the

[1] It is very probable that the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel (xvi. 9-20), though canonical and inspired are not from the pen of this Evangelist but are either a *résumé* of St. Luke or an addition of the presbyter Aristion with which it was sought to supply St. Mark's own conclusion that had been accidentally lost. For it is difficult to see how the original redaction of the Gospel should have ended with the words εφοβουντο γαρ, and make no mention of the appearances in Galilee as was promised in xvi. 7. *Cf.* Jacquier. *Hist. des Livres du N.T.* Paris, 1907, Vol. II, pp. 500 *sqq.*

empty tomb which are contained in Matthew and Luke are not, as M. Loisy unwarrantably suggests,[1] merely the repetition of an apologetic legend originated by the redactor of St. Mark's Gospel, but the historical account of a fact well known to the primitive Christians, and thoroughly attested by the different sources from which the Evangelists obtained their information.

14. There has been much discussion in these days concerning the empty tomb, and we have been told that the disappearance of the body of Jesus is no proof of His resurrection.[2]

This is quite true; and it was on this account that St. Paul and the first preachers of Christianity—as far as can be learned from the Epistles and the discourses in the Acts of the Apostles—having reminded their readers that our Lord had really died, since He had been really buried,[3] do not appear to have dwelt upon the discovery of the empty tomb, but appeal rather to the testimony of those who had seen and touched the Risen Christ. If the empty tomb be not itself a proof of the Resurrection it is very strong corroborative evidence of a material kind in its favour, evidence too, that is decidedly embarrassing to those who deny the Resurrection of Christ as the Church understands it. Hence the anxiety which has been shown of late to discredit the historicity of the discovery of the empty tomb, with what success remains to be seen.

"It may be taken for granted," says M. Loisy, "that the soldiers took down the bodies from the cross before evening, and flung them into the common pit into which the bodies of the condemned were usually flung indiscriminately. Whatever may have occurred, the circumstances of the burial were such

[1] *Evangiles Synoptiques.* Introduction, C. III, pp. 104-105; C. IV, p. 134; C. V., p. 163.

[2] Le Roy. *Dogme et Critique.* Paris, 1905, pp. 185, 199.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 4; Col. ii. 12; Acts xiii. 29. The burial of Jesus is also alluded to in Acts ii. 29-32.

that, even if it had been sought, it would have been impossible to identify the body of the Saviour after a few days."[1]

This "whatever may have occurred" is delightfully ingenuous. It is an undisguised avowal of the prejudiced manner in which the author has set himself to deny that Jesus received special burial despite all that history has to say regarding the fact. M. Loisy hopes to avoid the difficulty in which, after twenty centuries, unbelievers in the Resurrection of Christ find themselves because of their inability to account for the disappearance of the Body of Jesus. This novel method of attempting to deny an historical fact is not more successful than the others, while it shows how unscrupulous its authors really are concerning that historical objectivity for which they express such anxiety, when they sacrifice it so unblushingly in order that they may give some appearance of consistency to their theories.

The hypothesis of a common pit is thoroughly Parisian; and to inexperienced persons it may appear so satisfactory as to require no further proof. Unfortunately for them it is quite contrary to the traditions of Israel. The Jews to whom St. Matthew replied (xxviii. 15), accused the disciples of having stolen the body of Christ. The same story obtained credence in the Jewish circles frequented by Justin of Naplouse the Apologist in the second century,[2] and was repeated in Jewish anti-Christian controversies in the twelfth century, with this difference, that the body was stolen by Judas that he might have the laugh at the disciples, and amuse himself at their expense.[3]

[1] *Evang. .Synoptiques.* Introd. C. vii. La Carrière de Jesus, p. 228.

[2] "You have chosen certain men whom you have sent to proclaim everywhere: Behold! a seducer named Jesus of Galilee founded a sect which owns neither God nor law, and when we crucified him, his disciples stole his body by night from the tomb in which it had been buried, and they deceive men by saying that he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven." Dialogue with Tryphon the Jew. n. 108. P.G., Vol. VI, Col. 725-728.

[3] "Judas, a pious and wise man, having learned of Jesus the Sacred Name, whereby the latter had worked his miracles, delivered

From the first century to the present time the Jews do not even appear to have dreamt of the hypothesis of a "common pit," for the simple reason that such a mode of burial was unknown to them. Deuteronomy (xxi. 23) orders that the body of the condemned shall be buried before nightfall, but says nothing as to the manner of burial. The Mishna is more explicit. We read that: "The condemned is not interred in the family vault; the tribunal possessed two burial places, one for those who had been sentenced to be beheaded or strangled, the other for those condemned to be stoned or burnt. When the flesh had disappeared the bones were exhumed and brought for burial in the family vault."[1]

There was a burial-ground therefore, for those who had been condemned, but the graves were so distinct from each other that, long after burial, when the flesh had completely disappeared, it was possible to identify the bones, and to disinter them for re-burial in the family vault. But there is no mention of a "common pit into which the bodies of the condemned were flung indiscriminately."

M. Loisy's hypothesis, utterly without foundation as it is in the history of Jewish legislation, is equally unsupported by Roman law which ordered the body of the condemned to be handed over to

him over to his enemies at the Feast of the Pasch. Jesus was stoned and hung upon the gibbet; but this same Judas, carrying away the master's body, buried it in a garden in the bed of a brook, whose waters he had theretofore diverted for the time being; whereupon he turned the current of the stream back to its original course in such a way that no one afterwards could find the body of Jesus the magician." Cited from the *Toledoth Jeshu*, in the *Christ the Son of God*, by Fouard, Eng. trans., Vol. II, p. 358. note. London: Longmans Green and Co. 1901. The *Toledoth Jeshu*, a collection of anti-Christian Jewish legends, dates from before the thirteenth century for the *Pugio Fidei* of Raymond Martini, O. P. mentions them. There are various readings, and a different version of the legend may be seen in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. II, p. 879. art. *Christ in Jewish Literature*.

[1] *Sanhedrin*, c. vi. 4, 9, 10. The *Gucmara*, 10, also insists upon the custom of separate burial. *Cf. Le Talmud de Jerusalem*, trans. Schwab. Paris, 1885, Vol. X, pp. 282-283.

those who claimed it. Can it be said there was no one to claim the body of Jesus? It would be most improbable. Despite the testimony of the Fourth Gospel M. Loisy unwarrantably conjectures that, "the Mother and brethren of Jesus had remained at Nazareth," [1] consequently that on this Feast of the Pasch when the Jews crowded into Jerusalem in family groups, alone amongst His countrymen, Jesus had no one belonging to Him in the city. It is inconceivable that Jesus who had been received with such enthusiasm eight days previously, should not have had one friend, one sympathiser in Jerusalem whom the holy women could have asked to take the perfectly legal and inoffensive step of obtaining for them the body of One for whom they sorrowed. Such a step might, perhaps, have compromised those who were known to be the disciples of Jesus: but the sentiment of reverence which was sufficient justification of it, was regarded as honourable in the ordinary Jew. It is objected that Joseph of Arimathea who, according to the four Evangelists took this step, is unknown in Gospel history. Is it not a principle of literary criticism that an author who is desirous of handing down as an historical narrative what is really legendary, brings personages on the scene who are otherwise well known? The fact that Joseph of Arimathea is mentioned in these circumstances only is another proof of the authenticity of a narrative upon which doubts are thrown in defiance of every law of criticism.

We have dwelt perhaps longer than was necessary on the fact of the empty tomb, which is not an absolute argument for the Resurrection. But it was well to point out the liberties taken by "a certain kind of exegesis" with history. It takes liberties of a similar kind with psychology in its explanation of the appearances.

[1] *Le Quatrieme Evangile.* c. xxxiii., p. 880.

15. There may be discussion as to the details of the appearances, their number, order, and locality;[1] but when St. Paul's testimony given above is taken into account, as well as the four Gospels and the first chapter of the Acts, it is not possible to deny that, during a certain period there were appearances of the living Jesus to Magdalene, the holy women, Peter, the Eleven, and a large number of disciples. All these witnesses saw, touched, and heard the speech of One Who said He was the Master risen from the dead, and Who commanded them to go forth and preach that hope of which His Resurrection was the guarantee. This is an incontestable fact; one, moreover, which has not been questioned.

But here we take leave of history. We have grasped, however, if not the inmost supernatural actuality of the Resurrection, for that is beyond us, at least its outward shell, the signs by which the supernatural fact becomes history, and which are for us indirect proof, since this fact alone explains the empty tomb and the apparitions.

What became of the body? There can be no question of its having been removed either by inimical Jews,—since they would have been eager to exhibit it, or at least to have boasted of the theft; or by

[1] No one is justified in the name of simple exegesis in opposing a Jerusalemite to a Galilean tradition of these visions, as if the early witnesses had attested the truth of the Galilean appearances to the exclusion of those which occurred in Jerusalem, and *vice versâ*. Matthew and Mark, while they tell us that the disciples were bidden to go into Galilee to become witnesses there of the great manifestations of the Risen Christ, do not deny that other manifestations took place in Jerusalem. The appearance to the 500 could scarcely have happened in Jerusalem without causing a disturbance which must be avoided until Pentecost. But the less solemn appearances to Peter and the Eleven were necessary to urge them to go into Galilee, and to assemble there as many of the brethren as possible. If St. Luke only mentions the appearances in Jerusalem, it is simply because he is hampered by the narrow setting in which he has placed his Gospel narrative: Galilee, Samaria, Jerusalem. *Cf.* V. Rose, O. P. *L'Evangile selon S. Luc.* Introduction, p. xiii. The closing verses of his Gospel are a synthesis of the teaching given by the Risen Christ, they are not a chronological account, otherwise St. Luke would have the Apostles make the journey to Bethany at night to be present at the Ascension, and would contradict himself in the Acts without knowing it, since he tells us that the appearances of the Risen Christ occurred during forty days (Acts iii.). *Cf.* Rose, *op. cit.*, on the closing verses, p. 244.

friends—for they could not hope to deceive themselves; or by indifferent parties who would not have dared to violate a tomb without good reasons. The chief difficulty, however, in the rationalistic hypothesis is how to account for the appearances.

16. M. Guignebert gives the following explanation of the origin of the belief in the Risen Christ: "The death on the cross which he had never foretold, though tradition affirmed later that he had done so, was a blow to his disciples as cruel as it was unexpected. But instead of killing their faith it brought about a very fruitful reaction." [1]

This is somewhat loose writing, and the "reactionary" explanation is a strange one. If it was still agreed that the Master had foretold His Resurrection, as Catholics assert He did, basing their assertion on the unanimous testimony of the four Gospels, it might be argued with some slight show of truth that the "fruitful reaction" which had led the Apostles astray was the outcome of the nebulous, wavering hope that such a prediction had aroused. But no: Jesus, we are told, predicted nothing, neither His death nor Resurrection. His shameful death came as a painful surprise at the moment when His disciples were expecting His triumph: then two days later these disciples, crushed as they were by this cruel and unexpected blow, begin to think of their Master as risen from the dead. They see Him, touch Him, speak to Him, give to the transient vision of their dream the confidence their Master had so lamentably betrayed when He lived, and thus came to be dominated utterly by that conviction which is known to all men. The case is not merely unique; it is unthinkable.

17. This hypothesis will not gain any more semblance of truth from M. Loisy's statement that, this "powerful reaction towards the glorious future which had deceived the disciples" only began a few

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 97.

weeks later when the Eleven were gathered together with Peter at Capharnaum—we are not told why—and "led an inactive existence" which allowed their reminiscences "to flame up in solitude." [1]

Without doubt "it must not be forgotten that the Apostles had the same mentality as their fellow-citizens of Capharnaum or Bethsaida," but it is just this mentality which renders the hypothesis that "the inner working of their soul, aflame with enthusiasm, was able to suggest the vision of what they so ardently desired," and cause as many illusions as there were appearances, more foolish and more unthinkable. The Apostles were boatmen of Lake Genesareth or peasants from Galilee, men about thirty years of age, muscular, by no means neurotic, susceptible no doubt to ideas of the marvellous but not likely to suffer from hallucinations. Let us follow them as M. Loisy pictures them: Peter returning to the home of his mother-in-law, James and John going back to their father, Philip joining the fisher-folk of Bethsaida once again, all of them returning to that society from which Christ had withdrawn them for awhile in His foolish attempt to realize His dream, and returning too, in fear and shame at their escapade. Had not the carpenter's son made promises? Peter had once asked Him: "Behold we have left all things, and have followed thee: what therefore shall we have?" And Jesus said to them, " . . You also shall sit on twelve seats judging the twelve tribes, of Israel" (Matt. xix. 27-28), and lo! He could not save even Himself. What was left to stir up their enthusiasm? Words, not even promises, since the Master had promised nothing but a kingdom He believed He was to establish but all hope of establishing which had perished in the agony of a shameful death. Was it in circumstances of such utter despondency as these, made still more gloomy by the pitying or mocking comments of their fellows, that

[1] *Evangiles Synoptiques.* Introd. c. vii. La Carrière de Jesus, pp. 223-224.

"chance occurrences, interpreted and transformed according to the preoccupations of the moment, could have the same bearing as appearances, with an objective character that rendered them less open to question, if indeed, there had been any thought of questioning them?"

We are dealing with men who had been cruelly deceived, who, as we know were very positive and very much in earnest with the absorbing interest of a lifetime. If they deluded themselves by desiring to believe and preach as a real, what was but a fictitious resurrection, they would, as Saint Paul said, *have given testimony against God*, and would be *of all men most miserable.* They were aware of this; yet we are told that they did not think of asking questions, that they believed without any reservation the hallucinations of some of their fellows, and that chance occurrences were regarded by them as appearances. How unreasonable is Rationalism when, rather than acknowledge a mystery it accepts the absurd!

18. How much more human is the psychological tone of the Gospel narratives. The Apostles, having been restored to faith and hope by the first apparitions, returned to Galilee; then they set out to make known the good news with all circumspection to their brethren and friends. Those who believed them were met together for the great apparition to the five hundred. Once only did Our Lord appear to all the disciples: He appeared more frequently to the Eleven or to some amongst them. It required nothing less than these repeated apparitions of the Risen Christ to make these men,—*foolish and slow of heart to believe*, was the testimony of Jesus Himself concerning them (Luke xxiv. 25),—return to Jerusalem and throw themselves heart and soul into the work of preaching the Gospel without hope of any reward other than the Kingdom of heaven. No explanation that can stand the test can be given for these historical phenomena except one, the reality of the Resurrection.

But, we are told, granted that the explanation of the apparitions and belief of the apostles by delusion is improbable, is the Resurrection not a greater improbability since it contradicts all known physiological laws? And should not the wise man choose the less of two improbabilities?

As a matter of fact, the Resurrection is so utterly improbable to those who cling to the creed of unbelief, that it is considered preferable to accept any hypothesis however absurd, rather than recognize a supernatural intervention on God's part. But quite different will be the judgment, we do not say of the believer but of any man, who, while he holds no creed either religious or anti-religious, feels compelled, nevertheless, to question and, if possible, discover, whether there is not some Intelligence superior to the forces of nature which rules those forces and can modify their normal evolution. Such a one will deem it extremely improbable, even impossible, to admit the complete upsetting of the evolutionary modes of physiological and psychological forces without cause. He will discover not only a more probable explanation of such an abnormal phenomenon in the action of a Free Intelligent Will which governs the forces it upholds, and is able when occasion demands to act in a manner that surpasses nature so that sincere minds which seek Him may realize His presence, but he will find that this is the necessary explanation.

And what man if he possesses sufficient knowledge and is unprejudiced, can refuse to see the hand of God in the Christ-fact as history reveals it? A poor carpenter, unlettered, He appears amongst His countrymen in His thirtieth year possessed of no other credentials than His word and those wonderful and beneficent deeds with which His path is strewn. He breaks with the ideas which all His countrymen had entertained of the Messiah, and preaches a "worship in spirit" that is still the ideal of humanity, while He also preaches the "good news," and

promises the disciples He has gathered round Him, a Kingdom where they shall find happiness. He has the boldness to claim equality with God, and this, moreover, in presence of the priestly tribunal sitting to judge Him. Such a claim was inconceivable in a mere Jew, for the Jews held it to be a sacrilege. He is condemned and crucified for having uttered the blasphemy, and then He appears once more in such resplendent vitality that His disciples who had fled from Him, adore Him as the Lord and Saviour of the world, a transcendent Being, Son of God as no creature could ever be, because He had claimed to be so, and the Might of God was obedient to Him. Is the Hero of this history a seducer or a fanatic?

We shall not say as yet that He was the consubstantial Word. This is the teaching of Dogma not of Apologetics. But can we withhold our avowal that Jesus is the supernatural One Who came in the power and in name of God to point the way to men? "Blessed be He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

The astounding success of the work He began will convince us. But is this success not perfectly natural, we are asked, when the means are to be sought in the *Diaspora*, and in Graeco-Roman civilisation? What was the *Diaspora?*

CHAPTER II.

The Jewish-fact.

19.—The *Diaspora*. 20.—The Jewish-fact minimised. 21.—The unique case of Jewish Monotheism. 22.—Cannot be explained by any natural cause. 23.—The singular hope of the Jewish Race. 24.—The Prophecies. 25.—Plato's "Suffering just man." 26.—Isaiah's poem on the Servant of Jhahve. 27.—Its undeniable character of Messianic Prophecy. 28.—First reason for the obscurity of Prophecy. 29.—Second reason. 30.—Light brought by Jesus. 31.—The blindness of the majority of the Jewish people and its consequences.

19. When the Apostles began their mission the principal cities of the Roman Empire possessed numerous and important Jewish colonies, each of which had its band of Gentile proselytes which, though uncircumcised, adored One True God, the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, as their Jewish teachers did. These colonies formed the *Diaspora*, a Greek word which means "dispersion." Though the *Diaspora* was soon to begin that conflict against Christianity which still continues, it undoubtedly assisted Christianity in its early days by supplying the first converts. This fact is sometimes alleged in disproof of the divine character of Christianity, but wrongly; for while it does not explain the marvel, Christianity is itself inexplicable except we see in it the supernatural intervention of God Who prepared by this means the Kingdom of Christ.

20. We do not require to believe in the inspiration of the Old Testament to see the supernatural in the Jewish-fact. The divine character of Judaism will certainly be more apparent when the historicity

of Biblical miracles is guaranteed by inspiration. But since we should not appeal in Apologetics to the sacred character of the Bible, and since there is not unanimity even amongst believers regarding the interpretation of many Biblical narratives, we have no hesitation in examining the Jewish-fact from the standpoint of profane history only, or of Biblical evidence considered for the moment as merely human testimony, and of making large concessions to the demands of rationalistic criticism. Yet despite these curtailments, the Jewish-fact still urges to belief.

21. One of the most remarkable characteristics of the Jewish race is its Monotheism. Now "it is not merely the idea of One God which constitutes Monotheism, for this idea is to be found in polytheistic beliefs also, it is the idea of a Creator." [1]

"To attribute the origin of all things mutable and contingent to the free will of a personal being; to say that everything that exists, this unique Being excepted, exists only because of his choice and could be annihilated if he willed it; to distinguish in the most absolute manner this supreme, eternal Being who exists necessarily, from all other beings which exist only because he has willed that they should, this is Monotheism." [2]

[1] We get the Jewish idea of a Creator who is absolute master, not only from the word *bara* used in Genesis i. 1, but from the entire context of this chapter, from the general teaching of the Bible, and from Jewish exegesis.

[2] *Problèmes et Conclusions de l'histoire des Religions.* par M. l'Abbé de Broglie, C. VII, p. 203, Paris, 1897.

The rationalist Chantepie de la Saussaye remarks on this subject: "Although hypotheses, sometimes dualistic, sometimes pantheistic, with reference to the production of the world are the declared teaching of Polytheism, while Monotheism holds to monist explanations, neither Polytheism nor Monotheism are merely different conceptions of the world but are different forms of religion. These two forms of religion are characterized not only by the opposition between plurality and unity in the numerical sense; *poly* and *mono* do not here signify mere numbers but qualities. The gods of Polytheism are the numerous entities immanent in the world which personify the energies and divine activities in the world: and here we have the rich and poetic development of mythology. The One God of Monotheism is the spirit

On the other hand, "the polytheist, pantheist, or the nebulous theist who does not admit a free creation, attribute the origin of all things to necessity, law, fate; something impersonal in any case. From this idea of free creation a necessary consequence follows which is exclusively a characteristic of Monotheism: since Monotheism distinguishes so definitely between the Uncreated, Necessary Being and all other beings, it is compelled to reserve a special cult for the Creator—Adoration. The absolute transcendence of the Creator is shown by the transcendence which is equally absolute, of the worship paid Him. Hence the obligation to adore and serve One God, and to give to other beings only an inferior and quite different kind of worship. Hence again the condemnation of Polytheism and idolatry." [1]

Is this Monotheism, the belief in, and exclusive adoration of, a Creator, the religion which was revealed to primitive man? Faith affirms it. Historical criticism can neither deny nor prove it, for its conclusions, which are only probable, concern prehistoric not primitive man. But history does affirm that, when Judaism arose, true Monotheism did not exist as a public, social doctrine amongst any people. "Neither Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, Rome, nor India recognized a Creator. Amongst these peoples the Unity of God is not exclusive. On the contrary it is quite compatible with pagan plurality. It is the unity of a master who governs but who has not created the world, and with whom other divinities are associated; or it is the confused unity of Pantheism. Belief in one God certainly obtained in ancient China, but he was the heavens, not the creator of the heavens. The Persians appear to

which transcends the world. The tendencies towards a monarchical conception of a society of gods, a monolatry, or an abstract unity of a divine being, tendencies that are frequently to be met with amongst different peoples, are not to be regarded as Monotheism. *The only true monotheists are those who belong to the two branches of Judaism, Christianity and Mahomedanism.* Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte. Einleitung, 2nd Ed., Leipzig, 1897, p. 15.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

have had an idea of a being who had made the heavens and the earth, but inasmuch as they also believed in a principle of evil opposed to, and not created by this being, they cannot be regarded as monotheists.[1] Whence then does the strange religious doctrine of Judaism come?

22. Renan's poetical hypothesis that, "the tent of the Semitic patriarch was the starting point of the religious progress of humanity," is familiar.[2]

The free, simple life he lived in the desert enabled the nomad to form religious ideas that were the more perfect because of their simplicity long before civilised man could form them. Criticism has overturned this hypothesis. Each exploration of the desert brings to light the names of idols analogous to those which were worshipped by Shemites who were not nomads. Mahomet had to borrow from Judaism and Christianity the Monotheism he taught his nomads; while even at the present day certain idolatrous practices exist, which all the rigorist doctrine of Islam regarding the unity of God has been powerless to banish from those solitudes in which the patriarchal tents were pitched.[3]

[1] *Ibid.* In his *Histoire comparée des religions païennes et de la Religion Juive*, 3 Edition, Paris, 1908. M. Albert Dufourg summarizes with great accuracy the latest researches on this subject. "Transcendentalism, historicity—these are the two characteristics of the Jewish religion. It regards Jhahve as being at once very far above and very close to man. According to Jewish belief the Absolute energizes in history.....We discover the character of Hebrew Monotheism, and learn how the idea of God is allied with that of morality, and how it is imbued with the idea of the Absolute amongst the Israelites from the fact that, while there is Egyptian and Chaldean magic there is no Jewish magic, and that while the Jews possessed a dogma, dogma was unknown both in Egypt and Chaldea. The Jews did not believe that they had any means of compelling Jhahve to grant their requests: they considered it a duty to serve Him by living virtuously. Paganism, it would appear, regarded both men and gods as the product of Nature, and believed that the former by the exercise of a little tact could neutralize the superiority of the latter. To the autonomistic illusions of paganism Israel opposed the consciousness of man's dependence. The story of God's dominion over man and of man's usurpation of the divine is graven deeply on both sides of the diptychs of old." (pp. 319-320.)

[2] *Histoire d'Israel*, Vol. I, p. 43.

[3] Père Jaussen, O.P., the author of the volume *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab*, has frequently witnessed these nomads praying to the sun.

Rationalist criticism which strives to deny the revelations made to Abraham and Moses, appeals to the prophets. Whence, we ask, did the prophets obtain their monotheistic ideas? If they were able to discover what Grecian philosophy failed to discover and Modern philosophy has failed to appreciate, we further ask: Upon what power did the prophets rely in order that the austere worship of God, Who could not be imaged, Who was the Absolute yet Invisible Lord of all things, and Who was jealously solicitous for the moral sanctity of His adorers, should be accepted by a materialistic people whose genius is imaginative, whose mentality scarcely reaches that point of abstract thought which permits the use of adjectives, and whose sensual instincts drove them violently and continually towards the seductive rites which obtained amongst the more highly civilized and more powerful nations that surrounded and often ruled them?[1]

If I believe in a revelation made to Abraham and Moses, and in the influence of the Holy Spirit upon both prophets and the people, I can understand the question: otherwise, it is an historical mystery: for here again the psychological factors give a result that is altogether contrary to the usual one.[2]

But there are further surprises.

23. This little nation, though constantly harassed by the Assyrians and Egyptians who coveted its territory and led its people into exile by the banks of the Tigris and the Nile, never lost its confidence in God Who had permitted its oppression. Instead of worshipping the gods of its conquerors it waited for the overthrow of that worship, and, with an ever increasing enthusiasm, kept alive the consciousness

[1] In the *Etudes sur les Religions Semitiques*, by Père Lagrange, O.P.; and in *Canaan d'après les fouilles récentes*, by Père Vincent, O.P., we learn how the Monotheism of Israel developed amidst an environment that was wholly idolatrous.

[2] Cf. *Extrinsécisme*, by M. Berthau, in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*. (Dec. 1, 1908.)

that the benediction of its God should become the hope of all nations. It never doubted that the prophecy contained in its oldest records would be accomplished:

> "And the Lord said to Abraham: Go forth out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and come into the land which I shall show thee. And I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and magnify thy name, and thou shalt be blessed. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xii. 1-3.)

The prophecies we shall now consider are but the development of this strange aspiration. Before we discuss them, however, we should not forget that, while the gods of the mighty nations which once existed are remembered only in name and in the ruins of their monuments, the monotheist belief of Abraham counts its followers by millions in every country, Christians, Mussulmans and Jews.

24. It is true that the argument from prophecy only appeals in its full strength to believers, not because unbelievers "are *a priori* ill disposed towards this kind of argument,"[1] for they are no better disposed towards any other kind, but because we must be members of the household to understand its language when prophecy is in question.

Setting aside, however, the numerous prophecies which are acknowledged by the faithful, but the prophetic and supernatural sense of which cannot be, and is not desired to be, acknowledged by purely

[1] M. Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 55. According to this writer "the arbitrary interpretation of isolated texts, misconception, erroneous opinions, or cock-and-bull stories" are the only elements with which the second generation of Christians have built up little by little, "this mighty stronghold of prophecy, not a single stone of which when examined closely, is found to be flawless." (p. 60.) It would take too long to enter upon a detailed discussion of the prophetic fragments disputed by M. Guignebert, but we refer our readers to the various Catholic scholars who have written on the subject, particularly to the articles by Père Lagrange in the *Revue Biblique* (Oct. 1904: Jan. Avril, 1905; Jan. 1906), *Prophéties Messianiques de Daniel; Le Messianisme dans les Psaumes; Notes sur les Prophéties Messianiques des derniers prophétes.*

historical criticism, there remains more than enough to cause unprejudiced minds to reflect, more than enough to convince honest inquirers. And it is not verses or phrases only, but poems of different kinds, possessing a coherent unity and a definite meaning. It is not our purpose to draw attention to coincidences which might be fortuitous, but to the realisation of a work which was as surprising in effect as it was impossible to have been foreseen by those who announced it.

Let any one read the passages of Isaiah in ii. 2-5; ix. 1-6; xi. 1-10; xxiv.-xxvii.; xlii. 1-8; xliv. 20-25; xlix.; l.; li.; lii. 13-15; liii.; lv.; lvi. 1-8; lx.-lxv.-lxvi. Is it not proclaimed in quite unmistakable terms, first, that the righteous of every nation shall seek the light and law of Jhahve in Jerusalem? Secondly, that their conversion and salvation, as also the salvation of Israel shall be the work of a servant of Jhahve, blessed from his birth, yet dedicated to suffering in expiation of sin? Thirdly, is it not asserted, with an imagery the symbolism of which is not wholly obscure, that all things shall be accomplished in the reprobation of the wicked and the happiness of the just in a kingdom of transcendent peace, with new heavens and a new earth? (xxiv.-xxvii; lxv.-lxvi.)

The apologist cares but little whether these passages are the work of one and the same Isaiah or whether they are the part-work of several inspired writers, whose works, because of their Messianic character, have been included in the Isaian prophecy. He may, indeed, profit by the results of textual criticism. Why should he not do so, especially when such criticism has so frequently been brought to bear against him? Let the apparent mistake of the collector of these disjointed prophecies be made good; let the four separate songs in which beyond all question the servant of Jhahve is pointed out as an individual, distinct from the people of Israel he is to save, be unified (xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-7; l. 4-9; lii.

13; liii. 12), and we have a poem in praise of the Messiah, who, by his sufferings and death merits to be glorified and to become the teacher of nations, which is perfect in its unity.

25. Since comparison is invited between the prophet and Plato,[1] we accept it. When discussing the value of justice Plato makes Glaucon object to Socrates that, if the ideal of justice is to be, rather than to seem, good, justice does an injury to man. To give full force to his objection, Glaucon considers what would befall him who realizes this ideal of justice as perfectly as possible. The ideally just man must be "clothed in justice only, and have no other covering.....Let him be the best of men, and let him be thought the worst." In such a case he will be most wretched, in that, being thought unjust he will be treated as if he was really so. "The just man who is thought unjust will be scourged, racked, bound—will have his eyes burnt out; and, at last, after suffering every kind of evil he will be impaled: Then he will understand that he ought to seem only, and not to be just."[2]

Plato never expected that his hypothesis should one day become an actual fact. He certainly never dreamt that the just man who had been sacrificed should rise again, and that his sufferings ended, he should be gladdened by the spectacle of the multitude whose sins he had expiated and whose justification he had won by his death. Yet we read this in the prophecy of Isaiah of the servant of Jhahve. We give the passages in full.

[1] Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

[2] Republic, Vol. II, 361-362. Jowett's translation.

26. I.—THE SERVANT OF JHAHVE.

His Vocation. (*Isaiah xlix. 1-7.*)

Give ear ye islands,
and hearken ye people from afar!
The Lord hath called me from the womb,
from the bowels of my mother he hath been mindful of my name.
And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword:
in the shadow of his hand he hath protected me.
And hath made me as a pointed arrow:
in his quiver he hath hidden me.
And I said: I have laboured in vain,
I have spent my strength without cause and in vain;
Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord,
and my recompense in the hands of my God.
And now saith the Lord,
that formed me from the womb to be his servant,
To bring Jacob again to him,
and that Israel be gathered unto him;
And he said to me: Thou art my servant,
(Israel), by thee shall I be glorified!
Jhahve hath paid me this honour,
and my God is become my strength.
And he said: "It is a small thing that thou shouldst be my servant,
to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
and to restore the saved of Israel.
I will give thee to be the light of the Gentiles,
that thou mayest carry my salvation,
even to the ends of the earth.
Thus saith Jhahve,
the redeemer of Israel, his Holy One,
to him that is despised, the abhorred of the nation,
the servant of rulers:
Kings shall see and rise up,
princes, and they shall adore;
Because of Jhahve, Who is faithful,
even the Holy One of Israel who hath chosen thee.

Note.—The word "Israel" is evidently a gloss. Even rationalists admit this, for it destroys the rhythm of the verse and is in contradiction with verse 5, where the servant is not Israel, but he who gathers together the just in Israel.

We refer our readers to the article by Père Condamin, S.J., in the *Revue Biblique* (Avril, 1908) on *Le Serviteur de Jahvé*, where the subject is fully treated.

The translation of the passages of Isaiah is from the critical version by Père Condamin, *Le Livre d'Isaïe.*

II.—HIS CHARACTER AND WORK.

(*Isaiah xlii. 1-7.*)

Behold my servant whom I uphold,
my Elect, in whom my soul delighteth.
I have put my spirit upon him,
he shall make known the Law to the nations.
He shall not be heard to cry out, or speak up,
or cause his voice to sound in the public places,
The bruised reed he shall not break,
the smoking flax he shall not quench.
He shall faithfully make manifest the Law,
he shall not be slow or fatigued,
Till he hath set judgment on the earth,
and the isles shall wait for his law.
Thus saith Jhahve God,
who hath created the heavens, and stretched them forth,
who hath fashioned the earth and its fruits,
Who hath given breath to the people that dwell thereon,
and spirit to them that walk therein.
I Jhahve have called thee in justice,
I have taken thee by the hand,
I have formed thee and established a covenant of the people,
for a light of the nations.
That thou mightest open the eyes of the blind,
and bring forth the prisoner out of prison,
And them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house.

III.—HIS GENTLENESS, RESIGNATION AND TRUST.

(*Isaiah l. 4-9.*)

The Lord Jhahve hath given me
the tongue of them that learn,
that I should know how to speak to the weary.
The Lord Jhahve hath opened my ear
that I should hear as a disciple.
Each morning he awakeneth me,
he wakeneth my ear;
And I have not resisted,
I have not turned backward.
I have given my back to the smiters,
and my cheeks to them who plucked out the hair;
I have not turned away my face
from shame and spitting.
And the Lord Jhahve hath helped me;
therefore have I not bowed beneath the shame;
Therefore have I set my face as a flint;
I knew that I should not be confounded.
He is near that defends me; who will contend with me?
let us try ourselves together!

Who is my adversary?
let him come near to me.
Yea, the Lord Jhahve hath helped me;
who shall condemn me?
Behold, as an old garment they shall fall to pieces
and the moth shall eat them up.

IV.—HIS SUFFERINGS, DEATH AND TRIUMPH.

(*Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12.*)

Behold my servant shall deal wisely,
he shall be exalted, and extolled, and shall lift himself on high;
And if the multitudes have beheld him with horror,
by him shall the multitudes be filled with joy.
And he whose face was disfigured,
so that it no more resembled the face of man,
The nations shall admire it (him),
and kings shall shut their mouth before him!
For they shall see what hath not been announced to them:
and they shall understand what they have not heard.
Who hath believed that which we have heard?
and to whom hath the arm of Jhahve been revealed?
He grew up before him as a tender plant,
as a root out of a soil that is dry;
Without grace, without comeliness to draw our gaze,
with no beauty to please (us).
Despised, and the most abject of men,
a man of sorrows, and acquainted with infirmity:
And as one before whom we hide our face,
despised, and in our eyes of no account!
But he hath taken upon himself our infirmities,
and hath carried our sorrows;
And he appeared in our eyes as one chastised,
smitten by God and humiliated.
He was wounded for our sins,
bruised for our iniquities;
The chastisement that saves us was upon him,
and by his bruises we are healed.
All we like sheep have gone astray,
everyone hath turned aside into his own way:
And Jhahve hath laid on him
the iniquity of us all!
He was oppressed, yet he was resigned,
he opened not his mouth;
As a sheep that is led to the slaughter,
as a lamb that is dumb before its shearer,

By an iniquitous judgment he was taken away,
and who dreams of defending his cause?
When he was cut off from the land of the living,
and for the wickedness of my people was put to death?
They prepare a tomb for him with the wicked,
he dies with malefactors;[2]
Although there was no injustice in his deeds,
neither was there deceit in his mouth;
But it hath pleased Jhahve to bruise him with suffering.
If he offers his life as a sacrifice for sin,
he shall see a long lived seed, and shall prolong his days.
and the work of Jhahve shall prosper in his hands.
Being delivered from the anguish of his soul, he shall behold Him;
and by his knowledge shall his desires be fulfilled.
The Just One, my Servant, shall justify many,
he shall bear their iniquities;
Therefore will I give the multitudes to him as his own;
he shall receive very many as his reward.
Because he hath delivered himself unto death,
and was reputed amongst the wicked,
The while he hath borne the sins of many,
and hath prayed for the transgressors.

27. Is this prophecy or history? We may well ask the question, with such precision is the future outlined. Even those who do not recognize the prophetic character of the poem are forced to admit the complete resemblance between the Christ and the Servant of Jhahve. "No one can deny," says Dillman, "that this detailed prediction perfectly applies to what Christ regarded as His work, and to what the New Testament teaches with reference to the redemption of the world by Christ's sufferings and death. On this head, the Church from the earliest times has rightly seen in this passage (c. liii.), the most perfect anticipative description of the

[1] This translation from the corrected text seems preferable to that of the Vulgate: *generationem eius quis enarrabit?* which has puzzled so many exegetes, and which the Douay, Authorised and Revised Versions translate literally.

[2] This Vulgate has an important variant here, to which a prophetic meaning is sometimes given regarding the burial of Jesus in the tomb of a rich man, Joseph of Arimathea: *Et dabit impios pro sepultura et divitem pro morte sua.* But while this version is itself obscure, it does not agree either with the context or with the actual Hebrew text.

expiatory work of Christ that is contained in the Old Testament. It is wrong, however, to regard it as being at the same time a direct Messianic prophecy referring to Christ." [1]

Why is it wrong? If the description of the Servant of Jhahve is not prophetic and does not apply to the Messiah, to whom does it apply? Is it to the collective personality of the Jewish people? The majority of rabbis from the Middle Ages were of the opinion that the "Servant" was the Jewish race which, by its long period of suffering, expiated the sins of the Gentiles; or that he was the group of righteous Israelites.[2]

We are not surprised that such an interpretation is in favour amongst the rabbis, but it is astonishing that it should be accepted by independent critics. While it is quite true that the people of Israel are sometimes presented to us in Isaiah under the personification of the Servant of Jhahve, it is impossible

[1] *Der Prophet Iesaia.* (5. Aufl. Leipzig, 1890, pp. 470-471.) The passage is taken from Père Condamin, S. J., *op. cit.*, p. 341. The fact that the resemblance between the life of Jesus and that of the Servant of Jhahve is unquestionable, dispenses us from giving the numerous passages in the O. T. which confirm the resemblance.

[2] "The exegesis which interprets the 'Servant' in Isaiah (C. LIII.), in a collective sense, originated amongst the Jews in the Middle Ages; and, as Rabbis David Kimchi, Jacob ben Ruben the Rabbinite, Joseph ben Nathan, Moses ben Nahman and others acknowledge, its origin was due to the needs of controversy against the Christians." Père Condamin refers to the works of Pusey, Driver and Neubauer for the Jewish interpretation of this passage of Isaiah, and cites a curious extract from Rabbi Moses Kohen ibn Crispin (end of xiv. Cent), in which he complains that, in their efforts to uphold the collective meaning, his *confrères* have "forsaken the teachings of our masters." *Le Serviteur de Jahvé*, in *Revue Biblique*, Avril, 1908, p. 166.

We are not, however, to imagine that these "masters" accepted the Christian interpretation of the Messiah dying in expiation of sin. Some amongst them piled up misconception of details in order to preserve their idea of a non-suffering, glorified Messiah. Others admitted that the Messiah should suffer, but previous to his mission being conferred upon him. Others again admitted that he should have his days of trial and suffering which should be meritorious for the people. No one ever showed any desire to admit that the Messiah, Son of David, should die for all men. When the idea of a Messiah who should die became familiar about the time of Hadrian, it was a secondary Messiah who was referred to, the son of Joseph, and quite distinct from the Great Messiah, the Son of David. *cf.* Lagrange, O. P. *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (150. avant, J. C. , 200, apres C) III Partie, C. VIII, Paris, 1908.

to see this personification in the poem in question. The Servant is there distinctly spoken of as an individual; he is no less distinctly set apart from the people of Jacob whom he has brought back and from the people of Israel he gathers together, whose covenant he is, whose sins he carries and for whom he dies. It is equally impossible to regard the Servant as the assemblage of the just in Israel, the spiritual Israel. This assemblage did not suffer more than, or instead of, the guilty Israel; did not die for it; and could not have been commissioned to gather together the saved of Israel, *i.e.*, the assemblage of the just, since it was that very assemblage itself. How, then, can critics defend exegesis such as this? It is because the acceptance of the term in its natural and individual sense causes them very great embarrassment.

To whom, if not to Jesus Christ can the description of the Servant of Jhahve be applied? "Every effort to apply the description to some person other than the Messiah has failed. Moses, David, Oziah, Ezechiah, Josiah, Zorobabel, Jechoniah, Eleazar have been mentioned, but without success. Duhm as a last resource proposes some *anonymous* martyr, and confesses that "we are face to face with an inexplicable historical enigma." [1]

It might be an enigma to the Jews who looked for an illustrious Messiah whose image, as they had fashioned it, was not easily reconcilable with that of

[1] Condamin, *op. cit.*, p. 338. *cf.*, the article by M. Van Hoonacker on *Ebed Jahvé et la composition litteraire des C. xl, sqq. d'Isaïe*, in *Revue Biblique*, Oct. 1909. M. Van Hoonacker has little trouble in refuting the theory of Sellin who proposes King Joachim as the person to whom the "Servant" prophecy may be applied. While it is true that Joachim by surrendering to the king of Babylon spared Jerusalem the horrors of a siege, his action cannot be taken as an act of sacrifice for the salvation of the people, neither can he be regarded as a triumphant victim when we remember the derision in which this king was held by his contemporaries. *cf.* 2 Kings, xxiv.; Jerem., xxii. M. Van Hoonacker, with the majority of exegetes, eliminates vv. 8 and 9 from C. xlii., in his reconstruction of the "Servant" poem, though Père Condamin is of opinion that they should be retained. But he includes other fragments of the Deutro-Isaiah. According to this learned critic the order of the passages is as follows:—xlix. 1-3; li. 16; xlix. 4-7; l. 4-9; xlix. 8-46; li. 1-3; l. 10; li. 4-10; lxviii. 21; li. 12-23; lii. 1-12; xlii. 1-7; lii. 13-15; liii. 1-12.

the Servant in the Isaian prophecy. But do not the life, work and promises of Christ in Whom the humiliation and glories predicted for the Messiah blend so remarkably, furnish a clear solution of the enigma? If on the one hand, there is no historical reality, whether an assemblage or an individual, which answers the prophet's description of the Servant of Jhahve, or which could even supply him with the idea; and if on the other hand, Jesus has so fully realized this description that the poem has come to be regarded as a "fifth Gospel," must we not acknowledge that the spirit which inspired this composition was not that of poetical instinct but the supernatural breath of the spirit of prophecy?

It is impossible to attribute such a picture of the future to the elation of a believer or a patriot. Such elation would have made it impossible for him to have included in his songs things which his contemporaries or the Jews of succeeding generations, however enthusiastic they might be, could not conceive; the condemnation and death of the Servant as the condition of a renewed and triumphant life for the victim, and of salvation for all men, Gentile as well as Jew.

28. This prophecy which is clear to us is still an enigma to the Jews. Christianity alone has solved it. Its obscurity arose from the fact that the conversion of the pagan world was not the only thing for which the prophets sighed, and that the office of a preacher-victim was not the sole characteristic of the Messiah.

With the declaration of a new expansion of the spiritual kingdom of Jhahve in human souls, the

[1] It has been objected that the verbs in the passages which tell of the sufferings of the Servant are either in the Past or the Present tense. This is not the case with all of them, for towards the conclusion of the description the Conditional is used. Yet even if they were in those tenses the objection would not hold, since it is commonly known that poets, Shemitic poets especially, and the prophets in a particular way, in their desire to paint the scenes as realistically as possible, use the Present for the Future.

prophets also declared, they could not help doing so, the triumph and happiness reserved for the righteous.

The description of the blissful life of innocence in the first verses of the Bible; the promise of happiness with which the Psalms begin; and the ninefold repetition of that promise with which the Evangelical code was inaugurated in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 3-10), bear witness to the firm hope of the believer that a day would come when the divorce between virtue and perfect happiness would cease, and reparation be made for the injustice which the just suffer in this world.[1]

This hope meant more to righteous Israelites and the prophets than the mere need of justice. It was an intense conviction that Jhahve the Almighty Lord, for His own honour and glory, ought to repay the just whom He had chosen and who were so frequently oppressed by the wicked, by giving them final and perfect happiness.

What should this happiness be? The blessings He has reserved for us are ineffable, and what little we can say in describing them without using figurative language would have been powerless to steady the hearts of the Jews of old, whose religious sense was much inferior to that which the grace of the New Dispensation has implanted in our hearts. It was only by the use of symbolical language that the triumph of the just could be shown, the efficacy of which was to be gauged by its power to awaken a lively appreciation of future bliss, and which was consequently in closer touch with the loftiest aspirations of the prophet and of those he addressed. The relative element, therefore, must appear largely in

[1] Modern Stoics in their failure to distinguish between Hedonism, the ethics of pleasure, the inevitable source of egotism, and Christian Eudemonism, the ethics of happiness, a condition of true charity and of real devotedness, reproach us for entertaining this hope. We cannot now enter into any philosophical discussion on the matter, but content ourselves with the remark that, some who have preached the doctrine of pure disinterestedness, and, from the standpoint of philosophy and politics have found fault with the ethics of Catholicism for inculcating the hope of heaven and urging the support of the Sister of Charity, see nothing wrong in drawing a cheque for a million on Panama.

prophetic descriptions, and will reflect the "general tone, aspirations, dangers and interests of each epoch. Man cannot possibly image to himself a state of future happiness except by the idealisation of the present so far as the present is to man's advantage, and when all that is painful or disadvantageous is eliminated. The present is the necessary starting point, and in a measure serves as the setting of the future."[1] Hence, while the language of Isaiah who lived at the court of the kings of Judah expresses the joy which the peaceful triumph of the Davidic monarchy will give to Israel, that of Ezechiel, a proscribed priest, is expressive of his all-absorbing hope of the restoration he looks for, a hope that is based upon the re-establishment of worship. Whatever the prophets may have thought—and they may quite possibly not always have known the full purport of

[1] Loisy. *L'Espérance Messianique*, in the *Revue d'Histoire et de la Littérature Religieuse*, 1898. p. 402.

Having shown in his article *Pascal et les Prophéties Messianiques* (Rev. Biblique, Oct. 1906, p. 536), that the object towards which all prophecy converged was the promise of salvation, moral perfection in this life, and complete happiness in the next, Père Lagrange, O. P., makes the following wise reflexions on the necessity of prophetic symbolism. "In order that the hope might be kept alive and energetic it was necessary that it should form part of the intimate history of the Jews, that it should embrace and consecrate all their legitimate aspirations, and that it should be the horizon of Palestine and Jerusalem. It is not a fictitious element introduced by God to lead them astray, but the natural course of events which He did not wish to disturb but to direct to a higher end. He alone could promise and give salvation; and the gift, bestowed according to His promise, is an unequivocal proof of His personal intervention in history. But since the promise was made known by men of a definite race, of a particular country, it reflected their pre-occupations, trials and efforts, nay their passions, for the law was framed in view of the weaknesses of the people.

The restoration of the Throne of David, the Return of the Twelve Tribes, universal dominion, these were dreams that we cannot say whether, or in what manner, God would have brought to pass if the Jews had remained faithful, but which, nevertheless, did not take precedence in prophetic thought of the advent of the Kingdom of God, the only real term of prophecy.

Pascal understood this. "If the spiritual sense had been revealed they would not have been capable of appreciating it." When he considered the spiritual sense under the covering of the earthly, we delight in explaining the metaphor, for the temporal meaning was inherent in the nature of things as the note of contingency is inherent in our actions. Yet so greatly inferior is it to the religious sense that it was doomed to disappear when the deeper meaning was revealed.

their predictions[1] significant features are to be found in a number of their predictions, that force us to recognize in them a new order of things, the supernatural character of which might be pictured with an imagery borrowed from the present life but not literally described.[2]

These indications, however, were insufficient before the advent of Christianity, to prevent the Jews from confusing the twofold perspective of the moral triumph in this life, and the absolute triumph in the life hereafter as symbolized by the descriptions of the material glory foretold for the new Jerusalem. Thus were they led to forget those prophetic characteristics which signalized the transcendent nature of the looked for Kingdom, and to narrow their Messianic hope to that of an earthly national triumph.

29. The different characters assigned to the Messiah was another cause of misunderstanding.

"The Old Testament had described in various ways the One Who was to work salvation in the future.

"First it was God Himself. Numerous passages declared that God should come in person to save His people.[3]

"The salvation of Israel, therefore, should be a marvellous theophany, an extraordinary manifestation of God's goodness towards His people, of His justice towards His enemies, of His purifying and consuming sanctity. Again, a king was expected, a son of David, who should sit upon the throne of his fathers, and be the means through whom the nation should experience untold prosperity.[4]

[1] "Since the intelligence of the prophet is a defective instrument even true prophets are not always aware of the intentions of the Holy Spirit in the things they have seen, or heard, or done." Sum. Theol. Ia. IIæ. Q. clxxii. a. 4.

[2] *Cf.*, Isaiah ii. 6-16; xi. 6-10; xxiv. 18-25; xxv. 6-8; lx. 18-22; Ezechiel xlvii.

[3] Isaiah i. 24-ii. 5; xxx. 18 *sqq.*; xxxv.; xl.; xliii.; Jeremiah xxx. and xxxi., etc.

[4] Isaiah xi.; Micheas v.; Psalm ii.

Isaiah alluded to his miraculous birth and gave him divine names.[1]

"The same passage of Isaiah contained the description of a Servant of Jhahve who should convert the nations to the faith of Israel, and whose death should be expiatory for many.

"Daniel had foretold that God would intervene to destroy the oppressors, and had described a supernatural being coming down from heaven to establish the kingdom of the saints.[2]

"Were these prophecies, stretching forward as they did towards the light to come, parallel prophecies? If they were not, how shall they be co-ordinated? Will the Messiah, in the forcible language of Isaiah, be a God? Will he not rather be a man, merely the instrument of God's designs? Will he be the same as the gentle preacher, the victim of his own zeal and docility who repeats the precepts of Jhahve? Will the Restorer of the throne be a martyr? a Redeemer? Will the supernatural being whom Daniel describes come upon earth for any other purpose than for the overthrow of the kingdoms that are doomed? That all these conditions should be fulfilled by one person only, appeared, nay, was, extremely difficult, or rather, it would have demanded an unheard of miracle whose mystery had not been revealed, not, certainly in official tradition (Eph. iii. 5-8).[3]"

Jewish schools have wearied themselves in the vain attempt to unravel the apparently irreconcilable contradictions which the figure of Christ as it is sketched by conjoint prophecy offers to them. It is interesting to read the different solutions proposed by Jewish thinkers of our Lord's time: they may be found in the volume from which we have taken the preceding passage, and they convince one of this fact, that the solution given by Christ Himself could

[1] ix. 5 *sqq.*

[2] vii. 5 *sqq.*

[3] Lagrange. *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, pp. 258-9. Comparaison de l'apocalyptique et du rabbinisme.

not have been obtained from the ideas of His contemporaries, since they were incapable of agreeing among themselves concerning the interpretation of an enigma which, humanly speaking, was inexplicable.

30. If, however, there was darkness, there was also light. It was reserved to Jesus to break the seals of the prophetic secret, and to lay bare the spiritual meaning which had been more or less hidden beneath the veils of the letter.[1]

The public preaching of our Lord as we see it in the Synoptics, is wholly directed towards the preparation of His countrymen for a better understanding of the prophecies and the work of the Messiah. Jesus does not renounce the glorious hopes of the prophets:

[1] We cannot refrain from giving Pascal's profound reflexions on the double meaning of the prophecies, the literal and the spiritual. "When we intercept an important letter in which we find a clear meaning and where nevertheless it is said that the meaning is veiled and obscure; that it is hidden, so that you shall see this letter without seeing it, and hear without hearing it; what should one think, except that it is a cipher with two meanings, and still more shall we think so when we find things manifestly contrary to one another in the literal sense? How highly then should we esteem those who decipher the cipher and teach us to understand the hidden meaning; and especially when the principles which they show forth are natural and clear. This is what Jesus Christ has done and the Apostles. They broke the seal. He rent the veil and discovered the spirit. They have thus taught us that the enemies of man are his passions; that the Redeemer is to be spiritual and His reign spiritual; that there are to be two advents—the one of misery, in order to abase proud man, the other of glory, to raise man abased. . . ." *Pensées.* Translated by Chas. S. Jerram, M.A. Methuen and Co., London, 1901, pp. 150-151.

Dom Calmet makes the following reflexions upon this passage: "Previous to the fulfilment of the prophecies, though there was no doubt as to their certainty, no one, as Origen says (Des Principes I., IV., C. VII.), could establish their truth: to do this it was necessary to witness their fulfillment. Even those who played a part in the events were taken up with that part and with what they had to endure; they never dreamt of taking a wider view, nor did they look to the accomplishment of the entire prophecy. When one is a complete outsider to the evil, and views the sequence of events unfolded in history as a whole, one is better able to judge them in all their bearings. It is when the prophecy is considered in all its bearings that it becomes intelligible. The Apostles confessed that certain prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, but they only recognized this after His death and resurrection. It is very probable that it was the same with the ancient prophecies. The people were concerned only with those events of the present, or the immediate future, which the letter of the prophecy revealed. The other sense, although first in the intention of the Holy Spirit, was only clearly discovered after Jesus Christ had dwelt amongst us." *Commentaire d'Isaïe.* Paris, 1714, p. xxii.

—happiness, perfect bliss are still the great Gospel hope, the things which made the Gospel "good tidings." And since imagery is necessary, He retains that of the prophets. In the future Kingdom there are thrones, banquets and mansions. But this Kingdom where life shall be everlasting, is not of this world. Nay more, it is not for the happy ones of this world. It is reserved for the poor, the afflicted, and the oppressed.

The Messiah, then, is not an earthly king, neither would Jesus have anything to say to this kind of royalty. He would not assume the title of "Christ" so long as His preaching was unfinished and there could be any mistake concerning the prerogatives to which the assumption of the title might give rise; but He assumed it when to do so meant death. This death should complete His expiatory mission, should prepare His entry into glory, permit His sitting at the right hand of God, permit Him to reveal Himself in all the splendour of His Divinity, to send the Paraclete, and to have the renewal of all things preached, the *μετάνοια*, the new life that should be the heritage of the elect of every nation and which should fit them for life eternal—though it should first be offered to the children of the prophets—with all the authority attaching to the name of the Risen Christ, the glorified Son of God (Acts iii. 12-26). In the Person of Jesus the Incarnate Word, all the characteristics whose seeming contradiction made prophecy obscure, are to be found fully realized.

Jesus is God Who comes in person to assist His people. "He is the supernatural being of Daniel, but truly Son of Man. As Son of Man and the descendant of David He must reign, but after He has taught, has suffered, and has died as the Servant of Jhahve. He came that the Kingdom of God on earth might be recognized, that God Himself might be served more perfectly and loved more fully. But it is through Him that God's dominion is established over the elect, since it is by His death and His grace

that the elect are admitted into the presence of God. Thus all the prophecies of the Old Testament are harmonious realities, and He Who is the fulfilment of promise is also the gate of the life to come."[1]

31. The Jews were urged to read their prophetic books once more in the light which shone from the teaching, miracles, life, death and resurrection of Christ, and of the wonders wrought by the apostles in His name. They could understand, and many really religious souls did so, but they are the minority. The chief people did not desire to recognize the Christ they had crucified through ignorance, thus fulfilling what prophecy had foretold (Acts iii. 17-18). What has been the result?

In the time of our Lord, the *Diaspora* played the part, and not unsuccessfully, of apostle of the nations. Those who adored the true God were influenced by, and associated with, the *Diaspora*, as has been already shown. But scarcely had it joined issue with the Christian community and begun its merciless strife against it, when its apostolate either ceased or was paralyzed. Its teaching became more and more overburdened with those trivial and ridiculous traditions for which Jesus had already reproached it, and which abound in the Talmud, fungi, the product of a worn out religion.

Without temple or worship, the few Jewish believers who still remain, wander along every road weighted with their miseries and their curse, carrying with them the records in which their hopes are enshrined but the key to which has been stolen from them by their leaders. A multitude, unconsciously blind, yet amongst which are to be found many who are in good faith, and who will be saved by the grace, and in the name, of that Christ for Whom they look, upon Whom they call, but Who is already come.

Without faith, without morality, the great ones of Judaism are possessed by an absorbing ambition to

[1] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

obtain the wealth and pleasures of this world, to destroy the beliefs and corrupt the morals of Christians even though to accomplish this it be necessary to preach atheism and to kill Jewish beliefs also. The effort is in vain. Christian faith, which was established despite the opposition of the Sanhedrin and the *Diaspora* in the beginning, will be well able to resist the attacks of the *Diaspora* of to-day, and even to win over those Jews who still believe and are still religiously minded while it awaits the final triumph of Christ and of justice.

The marvellous manner in which the life of Christ and the preaching of the Gospel have fulfilled the first demands of prophetic announcement, is a guarantee that this expectation is not any vain hope. The guarantee is still further confirmed, receives still further definiteness in the examination of Catholicism, the concrete form in which full belief in the teaching of Jesus is expressed in the history of the world.

CHAPTER III.

Catholic Consciousness in Primitive Christianity.

32.—Neither Dogmas, Ritual nor Church? 33.—Has Jesus condemned all Ecclesiastical Authority? 34.—The Primacy of Peter in the Acts and at the Council of Jerusalem. 35.—The Rule of Faith and the Unity of the Church. 36.—"Thou art Peter." 37.—The Catholic consciousness of the early Christians.

32. "It seems to us," says M. Guignebert, "that judging the character of Jesus as the Gospels portray it, we must logically conclude that He desired neither dogmas, rites nor a church."[1] Is it not somewhat disconcerting, then, that on the morrow of the death of the greatest and least understood of reformers we should find dogmas, rites, and a church existing amongst those disciples to whom He confided His work and communicated His most intimate desires?

What is the mysterious life of the Risen Christ? A Dogma. His place at the right hand of God? A Dogma. The forgiveness of sins in His name? A Dogma. The Mission of the Holy Ghost? A Dogma. The Judgment to come, and the triumph of the just in the future Kingdom? More Dogmas.[2] What is Baptism? A Rite (Acts ii. 38; x. 48). The breaking of bread? A Rite (Acts ii. 42-46). The imposition of hands? A Rite which none but the Apostles could efficaciously perform in the beginning. It was the Apostles alone who imposed hands upon the seven and ordained them Deacons (Acts vi. 6),

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 91.
[2] *Cf.* Acts ii. 14-40; iii. 12-26; x. 34-43.

and although these deacons could baptize they were not empowered to confer the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands.[1] But neither is it true that the community was disorganized;[2] it possessed a hierarchy, and this hierarchy's acts clearly show that the Sacrament of Order had been instituted. The Eleven are not mere witnesses to the Resurrection, they are accredited witnesses endowed with an authority which distinguished Matthias the twelfth witness, from Joseph who was surnamed Justus before whom he was preferred (Acts i. 21-26).

33. During His life our Lord had once said to the apostles who were wroth at the ambitious demands of the mother of the sons of Zebdee:—

"You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it (κατακυριεύουσιν) over them: and they that are the greater, express power upon them (κατεξουσιάζουσιν). It shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minister: And he that will be the first among you shall be your servant. Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a redemption for many." (St. Matt. xx. 25-28.)

Commenting upon this passage M. Guignebert says that: "It would be difficult to find a more definite denial not only of the Primacy of Peter but of all ecclesiastical authority."[3] How strange that it took twenty centuries to understand the meaning of this definite denial! The belief has always obtained that, desiring to teach His apostles and their successors, the "princes" and the "great ones" how they should rule the Church, our Lord had told them that they were not to abuse

[1] Acts viii. 5-17. It is untrue that, in imposing hands upon the Ethiopian eunuch, Philip conferred the Holy Ghost upon him as M. Guignebert insinuates in his *Histoire ancienne du Christianisme*, p. 257. Neither is the imposition of hands upon St. Paul by Ananias *considered* as the ritualistic imposition which followed Baptism but as a confirmatory sign of the revelation which commanded it.

[2] Guignebert. *Manuel d'histoire ancienne du Christianisme*. C. VII. t. 1, p. 256.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

their authority as the princes of the world did by exercising it for their own personal satisfaction and profit, but that they were to use it as He did, in the manner and measure which made for the welfare of their subjects, with a wholehearted interest in the well-being of all. It is in this sense that M. Loisy understands this very text. "The faithful do not exist to serve the hierarchy, the hierarchy exists for the service of the faithful. The Church does not exist for the Pope, but the Pope for the welfare of the Church."[1] Shall we say that he has not understood our Lord's words? In that case he shares the error with the apostles themselves, for the first Christian community recognized not only the "princes," that is an ecclesiastical authority, but a Head, in the Primacy of Peter.

34. That this was so is evident each time there is mention of Peter. The Acts, it is true, often speak of John as his companion, but he always occupies a subordinate position and is never on the same footing. It is Peter who presides at the election of Matthias (Acts i. 15-26): who inaugurates the preaching of the apostles (ii. 14-41); who works the first miracle (iii.); who replies in the name of all to the Sanhedrin (iv. 8-12). Such is the reverence for his authority that we are told how Ananias and Saphira were struck dead because they lied to him (v. 1-11). It is he who goes to impose hands upon the Samaritans (viii. 14-25); who visits all the Christian communities of Palestine (ix. 31-43); who is the first to admit the uncircumcised to baptism (x.-xi 18.) If any dispute arose in the assembly at Jerusalem between the missionaries and some Judeo-Christians, converts from Pharisaism, regarding the binding force of circumcision and the full observance of the Mosaic law by Gentile converts, it is Peter who commands silence and reminds them that they are not to discuss that freedom of action which he had

[1] *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, p. 20.

long ago proclaimed in the name of God (xv. 7). When the apostle James proposed that, out of reverence for the law of Moses, and to facilitate intercourse between Judeo-Christians and Gentile converts it was desirable that these latter should "refrain themselves from pollutions of idols,.... from things strangled, and from blood," he began by an acknowledgment of the principle of liberty which had been proclaimed by Peter (xv. 14-18).

Do not these things point to a supremacy? It is not, indeed, the exercise of pontifical power as we see it exercised at the present time; but the principle of authority is sufficiently established to secure its future application. No one has any right to say that Peter was unconscious of this authority,[1] because, forsooth, instead of commanding as Cesar—*sic volo sic jubeo*—he prevented scandal among the faithful by referring to a revelation of the Holy Ghost for the baptism of the uncircumcised. Still less right has any one to assert that in those days, "it was the will of the faithful which dominated and decided."[2] The terms in which St. Luke records the decision of the Council of Jerusalem do not allow such a conclusion: *It pleased the apostles, and ancients, with the whole Church.*[3] We cannot infer from these words that the "chief men" who represented the people and subscribed to the decision possessed the same authority as the apostles and presbyters after whom they subscribed. On the contrary quite another teaching is to be inferred from the expression "the whole Church." Not only did she teach "the brethren of the gentiles" that the church in Jerusalem was unanimous in recognizing their liberty and in repudiating those who had unwarrantably disturbed them, but she also teaches us that those members of the Council who were most violent in opposing the

[1] Guignebert. *Hist. anc. du Christianisme*, p. 256.
[2] Guignebert. *Mél. d'hist. et d'arch.*, p. 91.
[3] Acts xv. 22.

liberty of the gentiles, had to bow to the decision, and, like the others, to subscribe to a pronouncement which censured their own opinions. Peter had declared in the name of God that the grace of Jesus Christ sufficed for justification independently of circumcision. This was a new dogma, for our Lord had not explicitly taught it.[1]

However difficult it was to accept the doctrine, converts from Pharisaism had no alternative. The brethren of the other Churches were notified of it, and it became a Rule of Faith for them.

35. This is not a solitary case which affords evidence of the opinion that obtained at the time, of a Catholic Church welding together the faithful of every country in a unity of moral and dogmatic teaching that was safeguarded by a visible authority. Nor is it necessary to come down to the time of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, the struggle against Gnosticism, nor even to the period of the Pastoral Epistles to Titus and Timothy to meet with such evidence.

What is the Epistle to the Galatians if not the plea of St. Paul in defence of the Catholicity of his teaching? of its perfect conformity with that of the apostles? and a denial of the charge of singularity which had been brought against it by certain false teachers, who, while they acknowledged as he did, the binding force of apostolic belief sought, nevertheless, to evade it? What is the anathema with which he threatened all who contradicted his teaching, even though they were angels (Gal. i. 8-9), and those Gentile converts who had had themselves circumcised (Gal. v. 4), if it is not that excommunication which shall be pronounced throughout the future against heretics, against "the dogs" of which we are to beware (Philip. iii. 2), against false teachers who "cheat" the faithful "by philosophy and vain deceit" (Col. ii. 8), and those "ravening wolves" who will

[1] If He had taught it Peter would have appealed to His teaching instead of appealing to a revelation of the Holy Ghost.

not spare the flock but will speak "perverse things" (Acts xx. 29-30)? The bishops and presbyters who were placed by the apostles over the communities so soon as they were established (Acts xiv. 23), were specially admonished to safeguard purity of doctrine (Acts xx. 28). It is perhaps true that these primitive communities "were at the mercy of every itinerant prophet and his particular brand of prophecy,"[1] but it is not true that these revelations were "practically uncontrollable." From the very beginning St. Paul insisted that they *should* be controlled: "Despise not prophecies; but prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thessal. v. 20-21). It was not left to "a general vote whether the teaching of such an one should, or should not, be accepted,[2] it was compared with that of the apostles." If it was in opposition to their teaching it must be rejected (Gal. i. 8). All doctrine not in harmony with primitive belief and the instructions of the founders of the communities was a snare (*cf.* Col. ii. 4-9): and everyone who did not hold to the doctrine taught by the whole body of the Church is to be regarded with distrust, since he is "walking in the things which he hath not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of the flesh." (Col. ii. 18-19). Had not St. Paul, who received his doctrine from Christ (Gal. ii. 2), to compare his teaching with that of the apostles to be assured that he did not preach in vain? St. Paul recognized but one faith, as there was but one baptism and one Lord (Ephes. iv. 5). For him there was only one Church.

He frequently uses the term "Church" to designate particular churches such as those of Corinth, Achaia, Judea; but he knew that these "Churches," welded together in the unity of one and the same faith, of one baptism, and one spirit, composed *the*

[1] Guignebert. *Mod. et Trade.*, p. 51.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

Church, the Church of God, whose oneness was in opposition to the unity of Judaism, and which, as a Jewish zealot he had formerly persecuted (Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. x. 33; xv. 9). He knew that it was an organized society in which, though its members had different parts, the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were only divided for the closer union of all the faithful of Christ into one compact body, each member of which had need of the other. If this Pauline teaching is only fully developed in the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 22—iv. 16), a veritable treatise *de Ecclesia*, it is certainly clearly outlined in 1 Cor. xii. the Pauline authorship of which no one disputes, and which was written less than twenty-five years after the death of Jesus Christ.

36. We need not, therefore, be surprised that at this period a Palestinian writer should give the explanation of the name of Peter, and the promise which we read to-day in St. Matthew (xvi. 17-19), in Aramaic and not in Greek. The Master says to Peter who has confessed that Jesus is Christ, Son of the Living God:—

"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter: and upon this rock (Tu es Pierre: et sur cette pierre) I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."[1]

[1] We give some extracts from the commentary of M. Loisy upon this text. "It is quite unnecessary to prove that the words of Jesus were addressed to Simon, son of Jona, who should be, and who has been, the foundation-stone of the Church, and that they are not exclusively concerned with the faith of Simon, or those who hold the faith he held. Still less can the 'rock' be Christ Himself. Interpretations of this kind might well have been put forward by old commentators with a view to their moral application, and seized upon by Protestant exegesis in the interests of controversy. But if one is desirous of giving the historical meaning of the Gospel, such interpretations are nothing more than subtle distinctions which do violence to the text. The words of Jesus refer to the part taken by Peter in the foundation of the Church, and, we may say, presuppose it. They are not conditional, as the sequence shows; and while faith is the starting point, they have to do

Naturally M. Loisy does not admit that these words were ever spoken by Jesus. According to him they are the interpretation of the Christian sentiment of the first century. But even if this hypothesis were correct the words are eloquent testimony to the Catholic consciousness of the primitive Christianism. Upon what grounds, however, does M. Loisy deny that this is a *logion* of Jesus? Chiefly because in his opinion, "Jesus only preached the Kingdom and its near approach; He did not formally lay down the conditions of an earthly foundation which should take the place of the Jewish economy as a preliminary to the advent of the Kingdom." (p. 8.) In the following chapter we shall see the value of this assertion.

with the sphere of apostolic activity and ecclesiastical government rather than with the domain of belief. They have reference to the personal role of Simon Peter, not with the only truth which had been confessed by him. Beyond all doubt the invisible and divine foundation-stone is Jesus Himself; but the Church was non-existent when He was on earth; and when He left the world, Peter became the visible foundation-stone of the Primitive Church, the chief agent of the Gospel of Christ, the chief witness to the Resurrection, the chief head of the Christian communities which formed the early churches, and then the Church. The other apostles and all the faithful are certainly stones of the sacred building. But the foundation-stone upon which the house of God is built is he who has been established as such by our Lord—Simon Peter.....

.....Simon Peter is not merely the historical foundation of the Church, he is the actual and permanent foundation. In St. Matthew's eyes he still lives in the power that binds and looses, that holds the keys of heaven, and which is the authority of the Church herself, not, indeed, her diffused authority, the particular rule of communities, but a general and distinctive authority which bears the same relation to particular authorities that Simon Peter held towards the disciples and Paul himself. It is not a retrospective but an actual interest which the Evangelist takes in the chief of the apostles; neither does he regard the past except in so far as it bears upon the present. He affirms that Peter still lives. Such a tradition which refers to the whole Church exists, therefore, in the Church....This Church possesses that stability which one may look for in an edifice that is built by the hand of God upon a foundation like Peter. The gates of hell shall never prevail against her. . . The gates of hell, *i.e.*, the sovereignty of death which triumphs over all earthly, transient things. They close upon all men, and upon every empire of the world. They shall never close upon the Church, for the Church of Jesus Christ dies not....

....Simon's office is symbolized, first by the foundation-stone of a building, then by the keys, the insignia of a major-domo or comptroller of the household. In the Apocalypse Jesus bears the keys of David, for He alone can open or shut, since He is the Chief Administrator in the Kingdom of God. We may make the same distinction with regard to the keys of the Kingdom which has been made in reference to the

"If this text is authentic," says M. Guignebert, "there is no room for doubt....We must acknowledge that Jesus foresaw at least the constitution of the Church in the Catholic meaning of the term, since He appointed a head for it." This acknowledgment, however, required a corrective. "Unfortunately," continues M. Guignebert, "it is difficult to defend the authenticity of this text. It is only to be found in Matthew, and it completely breaks the sequence of the parallel narrative given in Mark (viii. 29-30)....Why has Matthew related what the other two have passed over? Can we accuse them of forgetfulness? The importance of the text in question renders such an hypothesis untenable."[1] Criticism which is usually so wide awake is

foundation of the Church. Peter will visibly use the power of the keys on earth in the name, and by the will, of the invisible Master. Our Lord only promises as much in this text; and though the term 'Kingdom' is employed, it is the Church that is referred to, in that the members of the Church are aspirants born to the Kingdom of heaven and already admitted to the celestial banquet which is being prepared. The keys signify the authority of the major-domo whose most obvious duty it is to keep watch over, and to refuse, or grant access, to the royal household. In this passage, then, they represent the power to receive those who are desirous of entering the Church, to keep out disturbers, while they also signify in a general way the complete exercise of ecclesiastical authority in regard to the treatment of persons....

....The power of binding and of loosing with divine authority is included in that of the keys, so that whatsoever Peter shall bind or loose on earth shall be considered as bound or loosed in heaven, *i.e.*, shall be ratified and decided by God Himself. As the power of the keys has to do with persons directly, the power of binding and of loosing is directly concerned with things. In rabbinical language, to bind and to loose mean to forbid and to permit, and refer to the solutions given by the doctors who interpret the Law. Thus the School of Hillel 'loosed' *more* than that of Shammai "bound." A wider explanation of the formula is demanded by the text. Peter's decisions are not the opinions of a casuist, or the scholastic interpretations of a legal text. They are real laws and regulations. One might almost speak already of a principal authority in the matter of Canon Law, chiefly in whatever concerned Church discipline, and especially the forgiveness of sins. Simon Peter, therefore, is the chief Apostolic authority in all that concerns the government of the communities, since Christ has given to him the keys of the Kingdom, in all that has to do with ecclesiastical discipline, since he has the power to bind and to loose. It is not without good reason that Catholic tradition has built the dogma of the Primacy of Rome upon this passage. The consciousness of this Primacy inspired all the development of St. Matthew who had in view, not only the historical personality of Simon but also the traditional succession of Simon-Peter." *Evangiles Synoptiques.* Vol. II, pp. 7-13.

[1] *Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise*, p. 226 *sqq.*; *Mod. et Trad.*, p. 89.

certainly not so in this case. What cause is there for astonishment that St. Luke and St. Mark who, unlike the Greek translator of the *logia* of St. Matthew, were not bound by the text, should have omitted a word they could not faithfully reproduce in Greek? For the play upon the word "Peter," similar to that upon Kephas in the original Aramaic, is lost in the Greek version. Neither St. Luke, nor St. Mark nor St. John have preserved any *logion* which they were unable to render with exactitude; yet the three were fully aware of, and give full prominence to, St. Peter's pre-eminence. In the Acts, and in the famous passage of his Gospel in which Jesus charges Peter to confirm his brethren in the faith (xxii. 31-33), St. Luke lays stress upon the fact. St. John is not less explicit when he recounts the words of the Risen Jesus: "Simon, son of John....Feed my lambs, feed my sheep" (xxi. 15-18). It is probable that in the primitive conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel now lost, a similar narrative was given,[1] but we are sufficiently cognisant of his views from the place he assigns to Peter throughout his Gospel, and by the unique position he considers that Peter holds among the other apostles when he gives the angel's words to the holy women: "You seek Jesus of Nazareth....He is risen....But go, tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee" (xvi. 7). And does not the name Peter which Jesus gave Simon and which has been retained by all the Evangelists, presuppose the passage in St. Matthew?

One must indeed be hard pressed for arguments to object that Jesus did not intend to give pre-eminence to Peter, because He conferred the power of binding and of loosing upon all the apostles (Matt. xviii. 15); and that He could not have promised him such authority when soon afterwards He had to rebuke him severely for his want of understanding

[1] This is the hypothesis of Father Semeria in *Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto nella Chiesa primitiva*, ix, Roma, 1902, p. 211

of the things of God (Matt. xvi. 23)![1] Because the power of binding and of loosing did not exclusively belong to Peter does it follow that he did not possess the exercise of the Primacy? When he was so puffed up by the promise that he dared to lecture his Master (v. 22), was it not necessary that he should be speedily recalled to a sense of his human frailty? And far from interrupting the sequence of the narrative in which it is placed, the eulogistic mention of the revelation that was made to Peter, shows us how he came to believe himself capable of discerning what was, and what was not, befitting the mission of the Christ he confessed. The severe reply of our Lord taught him in quite an unmistakable manner, as it also teaches us, that the revelations of the Holy Spirit leave man in his ignorance concerning those things which do not come within their scope.

If to the above mentioned testimony we add the texts which bear upon the mission of the apostles after the Resurrection (Acts i. 8; Mark xvi. 15-20), and especially the words given in St. Matthew (xxviii. 18-20): "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore, teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world," we cannot but be convinced that primitive Christianity possessed an idea of the religious work which Jesus had in view that is altogether different from what Harnack, and after him M. Guignebert, attribute to Christ.

Evangelical Christianity, the Christianity of Jesus, is, according to Harnack, an absolute, logical protestantism, "a religion without priests, sacrifice, dogmas or ritual, in a word, it is a religion of the spirit."[2]

[1] Guignebert. *Mod. et Trad.*, p. 90; *Hist. Anc. du Christianisme*, p. 299.

[2] *L'Essence du Christianisme*, First Edit., Paris, 1902, p. 282.

The work of the reform is not yet finished, for the reformed churches are still too Catholic. Each individual ought to unite himself to the Father as he understands Him, from the inspiration he receives in reading the Gospel and his direct intercourse with the Spirit of God, if he would be faithful to the intentions of Jesus. There is no other bond between Christians than the name of Jesus, the words of the Gospel, and the Spirit which gives them life. The idea of the early Christians was altogether different. The Christianity of the days of St. Paul, St. Luke, St. Matthew, of St. Mark and St. John, believed that there is, and must ever be, a Catholic Church, an organized society that is destined to carry the Master's teaching throughout the world, and which has received the guarantee that it should be preserved by a divinely assisted authority.

This primitive Catholic Church claims that it was intended and founded by Jesus: "*Upon this rock I will build my Church.*" It is upheld by the hope that the divine power of the Risen Master is always at its service: "*Behold I am with you to the consummation of the world.*"

Let us see if this claim be legitimate, and if this hope has always been realized.

CHAPTER IV.

Jesus and the Church.

38.—Objection: Jesus did not intend to establish a Church. 39.—Answer: Manifold assertions of the Gospel. Jesus calls all men to be saved. 40.—The Kingdom of God and its different significations. 41.—New scheme of salvation. 42.—Separation from the Synagogue. 43.—Jesus appoints Himself Head, and entrusts the work to new workers. 44.—Impossibility of passing over so many assertions which could not have been inventions. 45.—Why the Apostles did not immediately set about evangelizing the Gentiles. 46.—The expectation of the Parousia. 47.—The Coming of the Son of man.

38. "Jesus did not found the Church, and had no intention of doing so . . . we cannot repeat it too frequently, Jesus never intended to establish a new religion."[1] Is it to make up for the want of proofs that such statements are so constantly repeated? Those who established the Church affirmed that they preached in the name of Jesus, and that they were commissioned and assisted by Jesus. No one doubted their sincerity. If, therefore, twenty centuries after the event we would accuse them of error concerning the mission entrusted to them by the Master who had brought them together and trained them, we must have solid reasons for doing so. What argument do they adduce who deny that Jesus intended to found the Church? They rely upon certain texts. They build upon certain facts. Jesus explicitly stated that He had not been sent except to the sheep of the house of Israel.[2] He forbade His Apostles to go into the way of the Samaritans or Gentiles. (x. 5). He had

[1] *Guignebert. Hist. Anc. du Christ,* C. VI, pp. 232, 239.
[2] St. Matt. xv. 24.

proclaimed as events that were soon to be accomplished, His return in the clouds of heaven, and the establishment of a Kingdom in which His elect should find perfect happiness. He did not even dream, therefore, of founding a Church on earth, since this would necessitate delay. Nor did His Apostles intend this in the beginning. They remained in Jerusalem for more than twelve years, and only set out to evangelize the Gentiles when persecution at the hands of their countrymen drove them from the Holy City. The Gentiles are the real founders of the Church. It was the outcome of the preaching of the Apostles as well as of the delay of the *Parousia*. The number of the faithful increased; it was necessary to govern them. The Kingdom was expected: the Church was the result. The Evangelists, under the impression that the event had been realized, attributed to their Master, by an error which was as far reaching as it was unconscious, words that He never uttered.

39. They attributed much to Him, far too much to allow the hypothesis of unconscious error, or to exonerate them from the crime of deliberate falsification, if we are not perpared to recognize the intention of an earthly apostolate which they attributed to our Lord.

The texts we have given, and which deal with the primacy and the mission of the Apostles, are not isolated testimonies to the intentions of Jesus to unite both Jew and Gentile in one faith, one hope, one worship in spirit and truth, and to call upon all nations to receive the salvation He had brought them. Many other words of the Gospel bear witness that Jesus was not more Jewish than the prophets; that He, as well as, and more than, they, had compassion on the multitudes sitting in the shadow of death; and that He, like them, desired that the light should radiate from Israel upon all nations.

The "Fishers of men" (iv. 19), whom Jesus had prepared, should work not only in Judea, they should

be "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world" (Matt. v. 13-14). It was not the Jews only who were to inhabit the Kingdom of heaven; many Gentiles, like the Centurion, should come from the East and the West to share in the bliss of the children of Abraham (Matt. viii. 11). The Apostles will be dragged before the synagogues, but they will also be arraigned in the presence of the governors and kings of nations (Matt. x. 17-18). It is the weary ones on life's highway, no matter whence they come, whom Jesus calls to Him (Matt. xi. 28). He is the prophet foretold by Isaiah who would reveal justice to the nations (Matt. xii. 18), and that consolation with which the grace of God assuages all miseries (Luke iv. 17-21). The leaven of the Gospel is not the monopoly of the Jew; it is hidden in three measures of wheat. Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles shall experience its power; the whole mass shall be leavened (Matt. xiii. 33). The field into which falls the seed of the Kingdom of God and the cockle, is the wide world, not Judea only (Matt. xiii. 3). The Apostle's net shall take fish of every kind, good and bad, and they must preach to all men without distinction of race (xiii. 47). Those who were first invited to the Marriage-feast shall be replaced by others who shall come from all parts without regard to whence they come; the Jews shall be replaced by the Gentiles of every country (xxii. 10). The Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached to the whole world before the end of all things (xxiv. 14). The Son of God will judge all nations; must He not be, therefore, the Saviour of all nations (xxv. 32)? And wherever the Gospel shall be preached, and that is throughout the whole world, the praises of Magdalene shall be sung, because she poured the precious perfume over the Master's feet (Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 9).

40. All men therefore, are invited to enter the Kingdom of God. This Kingdom is in

truth the beatitude of all the elect in a world transcendent; this is the great Gospel hope;[1] but it is something more. This Kingdom whose perfect blessedness and glory lie beyond this evil world, is also to be found in a preparatory state here on earth. The reign of God in human souls begins here; here also begins that state of justice which transforms men interiorly (Luke xvii, 20). Here on earth the soul in its restless quest may find that pearl of great price, that hidden treasure, that real happiness which, once it is found, is not considered too dear when its purchase entails the sacrifice of every other treasure (Matt. xiii. 44-47; Luke xiii. 33). It must be sought before everything else (Matt. vi. 33). The language of the Gospel is the language of this Kingdom, a fruitful seed indeed, since it brings forth a veritable harvest of virtue in the human heart, which, in truth, grows slowly, and may be hindered or destroyed in many ways. The power of God is able to bring this seed to full maturity, and to the ultimate perfection of full beatitude in the souls of the children of the Kingdom, while the sower need not be over anxious (Matt. xiii. 18-23; Mark iv. 26-29; Luke viii. 11-15). There is another seed which is also productive of vital energy parallel with, but contrary to, the life that springs from the seed which the Son of Man has sown in the world. And these two sources of activity are so closely intermingled, that no man is able to distinguish with certainty the children of the kingdom of evil by their actions in this life, or to differentiate between the good grain and the cockle. It is only when all things shall have been fulfilled that this separation will take place (Matt. xiii. 25-30; 37-43). If men will not receive with childlike humility and confidence the leaven of life which belongs to the Kingdom, they shall never enter it; for the Kingdom does not mean only a new impulse to good, it also means the gathering together of those who receive it.

[1] St. Matt. v. 10-12; xiii. 43; xxii. 30; xxv. 34; St. Luke xiii. 29.

"Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a child, shall not enter it" (Luke xviii. 17).

41. For the Kingdom of God in this world is an assemblage of men and a new economy of salvation. There are good and bad amongst them (Matt. xiii. 41, 47, 48). This economy of salvation is nothing else than the mustard seed which, the least of all seeds when it is sown, becomes a great tree to shelter the children of heaven (Matt. xiii. 31, 32; Mark iv. 31; Luke xiii. 19). It is different from that of the Old Testament, and takes its place (Matt. xi. 12-14; Luke xvi. 16). The least in this new Kingdom are above John the Baptist and greater than he (Matt. xi. 11). When our Lord preached, this new regime was not as yet completely inaugurated, but it was at hand; and our Lord's miracles, and above all His exorcisms, were signs of this spiritual reign which was to snatch so many souls from the power of the spirits of evil (Matt. xii. 28, 29; Luke xi. 20-24; Matt. xi. 5-6).

42. Was this new economy of salvation, with the Gentiles it would bring together, to become attached to the Synagogue? By no means. "Nobody putteth a piece of raw cloth unto an old garment" (Matt. ix. 16). To express the Gospel in the formulas and economy of Judaism would be to "put new wine into old bottles." The old bottles would break. New wine requires new bottles (Matt. ix. 17; Mark ii. 20-21; Luke v. 36-38). The Jews, moreover, had little liking for the Gospel: "And no man drinking old, hath presently a mind to new: for he saith: The old is better" (Luke v. 39). Could the children of the Kingdom have been given over to those who looked after the interests of Judaism? The Sadducees and Pharisees were blind; "they knew how to discern the face of the sky" but not the signs of the Kingdom (Matt. xvi. 1-5); they did not wish to enter the Kingdom themselves, neither would they suffer others to enter (Matt. xxiii. 13). And far

from showing honour to the Son of the Lord of the vineyard, they killed him. The vineyard which had been let out to them should be taken from them and let out to others (Matt. xxi. 33-41; Mark xii. 1-9; Luke xx. 9-16).

43. He whom they rejected and killed, shall become the corner-stone of a new building (Matt. xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10-11; Luke xx. 17-18). To bear witness to His glory and to imitate Him, to confess Him by word and act, shall be the work of the children of the Kingdom (Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8; xiv. 27). They must love Him more than father or mother (Matt. x. 37; Luke xiv. 26); accept and bear His yoke which is sweet and light (Matt. xi. 30); endure for His sake that warfare which He brought upon earth, a warfare that is waged even in the family circle itself (Matt. x. 34; Luke xii. 51); for He is holier and greater than what is holiest and most sacred in Judaism. He is Lord of the Sabbath; greater than the Temple (Matt. xii. 6-8); the One to whom the Father hath delivered all things (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22), even the race of men for judgment (Matt. xxv. 32).

Is not this the language of a master who not only intended to establish a religion which should be perfect, and which should be superior to that of Moses, but who further intended that this religion should be the meeting-point with God His Father? And He required other workmen than the husbandmen of old in order that He might accomplish His purpose. He had compassion on the multitudes whom He beheld as sheep without a shepherd (Matt. ix. 36). It is quite true that, as our opponents insist, His personal teaching was confined to Israel; yet looking beyond these narrow boundaries, He saw the whitening harvest of souls whom He would draw to Himself when He should be glorified, and He prayed that His Father should be asked to send many workmen (Matt. ix. 37-38; Luke x. 2). He set about preparing them Himself, and for this end He chose the Twelve and

sent them forth on a mission which was itself confined to the Jewish nation, but whose restricted programme was not in anyway the condition of that universal mission with which He would entrust them later. If St. Matthew according to his usual method puts into a single discourse all the instructions given in reference to the apostolate, and cites them on the occasion of the first mission of the Twelve to the Jews (Matt. x.), St. Luke emphasizes the temporary character of this mission very clearly when he speaks of the return of the missionaries (ix. 1-10; x. 1-18), and relates how our Lord warned His disciples of the still greater difficulties of their world mission (xxii. 35-36). They are only a handful of men, a little flock. But this flock need not fear for it has pleased the Father to give it the Kingdom (xii. 32), not only the full beatitude of the Kingdom in its perfect state hereafter, but also that divine power which shall enable the flock and the Church to advance the cause of justice and of holiness in this world, the power to bind and to loose the consciences of men (Matt. xviii. 18).

44. Remembering this, what cause is there for surprise when we find Jesus speaking of His Church and appointing a head: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her"?[1]

Mgr. Batiffol replies as follows to the principal objections made against the authenticity of the promises of Jesus to Peter. "Upon this rock I will build my Church," said Jesus: three words may constitute a valid difficulty in this passage, the classic objection of contemporary Protestant criticism. It is urged that the notion of ἐκκλησία is of Pauline origin, and it is further observed that St. Paul speaks of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ not as yet of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ χριστοῦ.

As regards the application of the word "to build" it is certainly Pauline. The *logion* attributed by St. Matthew to Jesus, therefore, bears the mark of a date posterior to the preaching of the Gospel.

This difficulty is not conclusive, since, first, the term ἐκκλησία, to mention the word only, is not of Pauline origin as it is to be found in the Septuagint where it signifies, like the synonymous term συναγωγή the assemblage of the Jews of the same locality. The "preacher" is one who speaks before such an

If this were an isolated text we might suspect that it was a later interpolation; but how can we regard the words as being foreign to the intentions of the Master, when they are but the climax of so many other testimonies taken from the Parables, that is from those picturesque and living Gospel fragments which all critics acknowledge best show forth the original stamp of the teaching of Jesus? These numerous synoptic attestations which bear one upon the other, complete each other, explain and support each other, are cumulative. One might collect a number of conjectures which would obscure, under the pretext of clearing up, some of these attestations taken singly; *but such a proceeding would have no cumulative force.*

assembly. In Stephen's discourse (Acts vii. 38), the term is used in the Septuagint sense and designates the reunion of the people of Israel under Moses in the desert. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews uses the term in reference to the assemblage of the just of Israel in the Heavenly Jerusalem (Heb. xii. 23). To build an ἐκκλησία is a figure, bold perhaps, which St. Paul has developed and applied: but we should remark that in the *logion* of St. Matthew it is put forward in its simplest form by the context: a rock is chosen on which to build, nothing can injure what is built upon a rock. We are far distant yet from the Pauline developments of the building process, and this is rather the mark of an archaism than anything else. There remains another difficulty; Christ said *My Church*, an expression which is without analogy in the New Testament. I confess that such analogies would be somewhat embarrassing, for if this *logion* was of recent origin, should we not discover in it something of the language of the Pauline Epistles and the Acts? Since the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ alone was in use (see, however, Romans xvi. 16) at the time when St. Matthew's Gospel was composed, why is Christ not to say τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μου ?.....Jesus it is Who calls, assembles, and desires that all should come to Him, be with Him, and Who imposes a yoke similar to that of the Law, but sweet and light which the Law was not. He it is, moreover, Who can destroy the temple and build it up again three days afterwards. Are there not here so many similitudes of the expression. "I will build my Church?"

Mgr. Batiffol goes on to observe that at the date of the composition of St. Matthew's Gospel—even if it be at the end of the first century—the exercise of the Roman Primacy was not so active that it could inspire a *logion* in which the prerogatives of Peter and his successors are asserted so fully. *L'Eglise Naissante.* Excursus A. Paris, 1909, p. 103 *sq.*

45. We have already examined the two texts from which some would infer that our Lord's views were exclusively Jewish. It is vain to appeal to the prolonged sojourn of the apostles in Jerusalem after the Ascension as a denial of their purpose to evangelize the Gentiles. Ought they to have renounced immediately all desire to convert their countrymen, when the first fruits of their apostolate was due to them, and their first discourses amongst them had been so successful? Was it not necessary rather to establish a Christian community and to be assured of its proper working, before they set out to organize communities elsewhere, and to live together as Christians before they began to sow the seed throughout the world? And Jerusalem, moveover, was the place best fitted for the apostolate. Each festival brought new proselytes to the city who departed after the festivals, converts to the new religion who would prepare the way for the evangelization of the *Diaspora*. Was it not in this manner that the Christian Community was established in Rome without the assistance of any apostle?[1] after Antioch, after those of Syria, after so many others?

[1] A first journey of St. Peter to Rome is problematical. A text of the *Ambrosiaster, Commentaire de l'Epitre aux Romains* (Pat. Lat., t. XVII. col. 45, 46), states that the first Roman Christians did not receive the faith from any apostle. The fact that St. Paul looked upon the Church in Rome as belonging to his apostolate (Rom. i. 6-14) and not to any other apostle, since he did not wish to "build upon another man's foundation" (xv. 20), confirms this statement. *Cf.* Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans.* Edinburgh, 1896. Introduction §3, p. XXV. Our readers are aware that St. Peter's death in Rome is no longer seriously disputed.

We do not agree with Père Hugueny in saying that: "Un premier voyage de Saint Pierre a Rome est assez problématique." The tradition of the Church has been constant: and so eminent an authority as Mgr. Barnes, to mention one only, writing in view of the archæological discoveries in Rome, tells us that: "this much at least seems clearly proved, that St. Peter must have lived a long time in the city, and have had relations with many residents in many quarters. Such results harmonize much better with the Church's tradition of a long pontificate largely spent at Rome, than the notion

And when the apostles had so many reasons for remaining for some time in Jerusalem, not to speak of possible motives which are unknown to us, can any one with any pretence at being logical say: "They did not go at once to preach to the Gentiles, therefore in the beginning they had no intention of going," when the apostles themselves assert that they went by their Master's orders?

46. We may hesitate as to the interpretation of the well known text: "Amen, I say to you, you shall not finish all the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man come" (Matt. x. 23). Does this mean that the conversion of the Jews shall not be accomplished before the end of the world, or that in this text the coming of the Son of Man does not mean the final *Parousia*, but some other manifestation of the glory and power of our Saviour as Judge, like the Resurrection, the Fall of Jerusalem, or the Foundation of the Church? Commentators are not unanimous; but this much is certain, that neither the Evangelist, nor the apostles understood these words as a prohibition to leave Palestine before the return of Jesus in glory. Beyond the fact that to give such a meaning to the words of our Lord the Evangelist should have made Him say: "before I come" and not "till the Son of Man come," he would not have attributed to our Lord a prophecy which was notoriously at fault when he wrote, nor would the apostles have disobeyed the commands of our Lord at the very moment when they were expecting His imminent return. Was the expectance of the *Parousia*[1] with all the characteristics which the apostles and

lately put forward by Protestant scholars, that, although no doubt he came to Rome at the close of his life and there suffered martyrdom, there is no reason to believe that he had, at any previous time, ever visited the capital of the empire." *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments*, p. 18, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1913. vd. pp. 9-10.)

[1] The term *Parousia* from the Greek παρουσία signifies in contemporary exegesis which has taken it from St. Paul, the coming of our Lord in glory for the final judgment of the world.

the first Christians attributed to it, incompatible with the intention of establishing the Church? It was not, since we are face to face with the fact that the Church was established and active at the period of this expectation. St. Paul was as fully taken up with the idea as the other apostles; but this did not prevent his organizing Churches amongst the Gentiles. In order, therefore, to show that Jesus could not have intended to establish the Church it must be granted that, not only was His knowledge of the future as imperfect as that of the apostles, but further, that His certainty of the near consummation of the world was as firm as it was erroneous. All the texts already quoted contradict this supposition: none of those which are brought forward to support it, do so. Let us take the most explicit of them: "Amen, I say to you, there are some of them that stand here, that shall not taste death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28). Taken in its obvious material sense, this text would imply that the greater number of the apostles should die before the *Parousia.* This would be to foresee before the end of the world, a greater length of time than would be needed to justify a social organization whose function it would be to strengthen the faith and hope of believers, and we cannot appeal to these words to proclaim as unauthentic those other words in which Jesus announces His Church.

47. Much more is required, however, to show that the coming of the Son of Man cannot mean anything else than the *Parousia.* Without having recourse to the language of the Old Testament which designates as the "coming," "sending," or "descent" of the Lord, the various manifestations of His goodness and justice,[1]

[1] Isaiah xxvi. 21; xlii. 13; Micheas i. 3. Father Knabenbauer, S. J., who asserted in his first volume on St. Matthew (C. X. 23, pp. 397-398), that the coming of the Son of God meant the *Parousia*, withdrew the statement in his second volume (C. XVI. 28, p. 77).

we find in the New Testament various texts which give the same wide meaning to the term "to come." They are to be found not only in the Apocalypse (ii. 5, 16, 25; iii. 3, 11), and in St. John (xiv. 23), but also in the Synoptics.

If the coming of the Son of Man is to be applied exclusively to His advent in glory at the end of the world, and of which only a few of the apostles would be witnesses, to whom are the recommendations "to watch" addressed, which are repeated by the three Synoptics? "Be you then also ready, for at what hour you think not the Son of Man will come" (Luke xii. 40).... Is it to the few Apostles alone and to their contemporaries whom Jesus, in the hypothesis with which we are confronted, foresees will be living at the time of the *Parousia?* This view cannot be maintained. Had Christ no interest in other people? Does He not warn all men of the suddenness of the coming of the Son of Man, and of the account which each servant of God must then render to his Master? The testimony of the Evangelist is explicit; it is not for those only who heard Him, or for the next generation that Jesus speaks when He urges them to watch: He addresses all the apostles and all men: "And what I say to you, I say to all: watch" (Mark xiii. 37).

But it is only the living who can watch. There is, therefore, a coming of the Son of Man other than the *Parousia* since this coming will find persons living who shall be dead before the final advent;[1] and in the above mentioned texts this advent signifies the individual sentence of reward or reprobation which determines, at the hour of death—always near and always uncertain—the soul's state, which its

[1] Mgr. de Camus does not give a forced interpretation to these texts when he interprets them literally as a preparation for death, and M. Loisy is somewhat ungracious when he asks: "Alas! Monseigneur, who will believe it?" *Autour d' un Petit Livre.*, p. 66. Faith is not required in order to let the texts retain their full historical sense, and to see that the *Parousia* is not the *exclusive object* of the vigilance inculcated in the later parables. Absence of prejudice, and the refusal to be biassed by the idea of a glaring error on Christ's part regarding the imminence of the *Parousia* is sufficient.

deeds have merited when they have been weighed in the balance of the justice and grace of the Son of Man.

But if the coming of the Son of Man may mean something else than the *Parousia,* does it not appertain to criticism to interpret the vague expression conjointly with other texts of the Gospel? Would it not be contrary to such criticism to determine arbitrarily that the text cannot be taken in an eschatological sense? or to assert that all the texts which do not agree with the announcement of an imminent *Parousia* are either unauthentic or merely traditional adjuncts? When, therefore, the same Evangelist shows on the one hand that the Kingdom of God is destined to develop gradually, and to obtain its members throughout the whole world, and on the other hand speaks of the coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom as something imminent, should we not carefully examine the statements? Instead of using the last assertion to deny and distort the numerous testimonies to the first statement, and to accuse the inspired writer of a contradiction which the most ingenuous writer would have avoided, we would say that, the coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom implies here, either the judgment passed upon Jerusalem and the consummation of the Mosaic faith—the first act in the drama of the universal judgment—or the glorious manifestation of Jesus by the marvellous growth and firm foundation of His Church.[1]

[1] On this question of the announcement of the *Parousia, cf. L' Avènement du Fils de l'Homme,* by Père Lagrange, O.P., in the *Revue Biblique,* July and October, 1906; or *Le Grand Discours Eschatological des Evangiles Synoptiques,* in the *Revue du Clergé Français,* Jan. 15, 1907. Our Lord always refused to give the time of the *Parousia,* and to the questioning of His apostles, replied: "Of that day and hour no one knoweth. . . . but the Father alone . . . . Watch ye therefore, because you know not the hour when your Lord will come." The vague nature of these replies in which our Lord embraced in the same perspective the end of that century, the particular judgment passed upon each individual and the purpose of the human race, and the general judgment, was an occasion of hope and also of apprehension to the first generation of Christians that the unknown day of the *Parousia* might be near at hand. Some say that Christ would not have permitted any

This interpretation is so much the more authorized by the prophetic formula of Daniel (vii. 13-14), which is in the usual undetermined prophetic style, and by the fact that St. Mark and St. Luke in their parallel texts do not speak any further of the Son of Man but only of the Kingdom of God. "Amen I say to you, that there are some of them that stand here, who shall not taste death till they see the kingdom of God coming in power (Mark viii. 39), ... till they see the Kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 27).

The Church is not identical with the Kingdom of God, it is its earthly phase. It is the visible manifestation and organization of the Spiritual Kingdom which Christ established in this world. The Gospels are for ever repeating that Jesus foresaw and willed this social organization of the faithful. Such was the opinion of the early Church, and we have not seen that it was erroneous. That Church was no more deceived upon this point than she was deceived in hoping continually to benefit by the assistance her Founder had promised to her. The signs of her marvellous vitality which we shall now examine will convince us of her divine institution.

misunderstanding if He had not Himself been ignorant of the time. Catholic theologians, however, with far greater reason teach that, while Christ by His supernatural knowledge was fully cognisant of the time, He could not make use of this knowledge except in the measure willed by God. God has freely and wisely measured the extent of His revelation, and we would be daring indeed, to attempt to criticize His ways because it pleases Him to perfect the hopes of the first Jewish believers gradually when they were wholly taken up with the complete triumph of the Resurrection only, in the beginning. Their hope of an early participation in the glory of Christ was true not only in the sense that death should speedily determine their share in this glory and give them the better part in it, but in the other sense also, that the thousands of years which must elapse before the end of the world were as nothing in comparison with eternity: "A thousand years are as one day with the Lord" (2 Peter iii. 8). Man understands with difficulty this nothingness of successive duration. To remedy this illusion and allow hope to retain that strength which the mirage of time had weakened, God thought good that the prophets both of the Old and the New Law should put the coming of the Son of Man, or His ultimate triumph, as the immediate horizon of the age which heard them, or in which they lived. It is for us to learn the lesson given by this wise proceeding instead of being scandalized by it.

CHAPTER V.

The Conversion of St. Paul.

48.—The Fact. 49.—The value of St. Paul's testimony. 50.—The psychological hypothesis of a progressive conversion. 51.—Renan's attempt at the naturalistic explanation. 52.—The admissions of Rationalists.

48. At the time when the Evangelists recorded their confidence in the Divine assistance of Jesus ever present amongst His own, St. Paul was a living and marvellous witness to the supernatural support which had been promised to the Church.

A zealous Pharisee, indignant at the sacrilegious impiety of the Christians who blasphemed the majesty of Jhave in associating with Him Christ Crucified, Saul had begun by taking an active part in the judgment and death of Stephen. He had imprisoned the brethren in Jerusalem, and asked for letters which would authorize him to seize and bring before the Sanhedrin, the Christians of Damascus. At the gates of this city, grace awaited him.

> "And as he went on his journey, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus; and suddenly a light from heaven shined round about him. And falling on the ground, he heard a voice saying to him: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' Who said: 'Who art thou Lord?' And He: 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the goad.' And he trembling and astonished said: 'Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?' And the Lord said to him: 'Arise

> and go into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do.' Now the men who were in company with him stood amazed, hearing indeed a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the ground; and when his eyes were opened, he saw nothing. But they leading him by the hands, brought him to Damascus. And he was there three days, without sight, and he did neither eat nor drink." (Acts ix. 3-9).[1]

Three days later, Ananias came to visit him, made known to him the will of the Lord, and healed him by laying his hands upon him. "Immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and rising up, he was baptized. And when he had taken meat, he was strengthened" (ix. 10-19). His energy no longer belonged to him; it belonged henceforth to Jesus crucified who had appeared to him as the Risen Saviour, and had consecrated as His Apostle the man who had persecuted Him. More than fifteen years, however, were to elapse before Paul began his missionary labours: three years were spent in solitude in Arabia, and some twelve years of a hidden life, of which we possess only the records of very short labour in Damascus and Jerusalem. The convert, burning with zeal though he was, knew how to accept the strengthening test of silence, nay, even that of the distrust shown him by his new brethren, and to await the hour when the Spirit would say to the presbyters of Antioch: "Separate me Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have taken them" (Acts xiii. 2). We know what St. Paul

[1] We give the text of the Vulgate; it is probable that the mention of the goad is taken from the third narrative of St. Paul's Conversion (Acts xxvi. 15). In fact the miracle which occurred on the way to Damascus is narrated three times (ix. 1-9; xxii. 6-16; xxvi. 13-18), and each time with certain differences of detail, which, while they do not alter the substance of the narrative, are a valuable example of the freedom with which the inspired writers set themselves to narrate what they wished to preserve.

did; we know the result of his labours for the spread of Christianity, and the influence of his writings on the theology and piety of all Christian generations. His life is the great wonder of primitive Christianity and his conversion is one of the most startling manifestations of the supernatural in the establishment of the Church.

49. St. Paul will always attribute the new tendency of his life and the superhuman energy which he places at the disposal of the Gospel, to the grace of God and the vision of the Risen Christ. How can we refuse to accept this conviction of the Apostle, when we learn "how he was upheld during an apostolate of thirty years, and how holy and beautiful was the life of him who attests to the divine origin of his mission. . . . For such a work, the initial glow was the gift of God. . . . . and that a consciousness of the Divine should be so firmly asserted, the first knowledge must needs be divine. . . . ."[1]

It was the new convert who carried Christianity into the great centres of the Roman Empire. Brought up at Tarsus, he had a knowledge of Hellenic civilization, and was aware of the formidable opposition it would show to the Gospel; yet, he did not shrink from the mission which Christ had entrusted to him. "He proclaimed a Jew who died on the Cross to be the Son of God and Redeemer of the world, though he was not ignorant of the repugnance which such a doctrine must inspire; but he looked forward to the day when the crowds would no longer mount the Acropolis but would descend to the Ghetto where he preached the Gospel of the Cross. He had disturbed the souls and had troubled the consciences of men in warning them that nature was not healthy, by giving them an idea of sin, and by declaring that all concupiscence was contrary to

[1] V. Rose. O.P., *Etudes sur la théologie de Saint Paul*, in *Revue Biblique*. July, 1902, p. 337.

God's law. He was not discouraged by his want of success at Athens, or by the dissensions in the Churches he had founded, or by the irremediable coarseness of human hearts, and the passionate revival of instincts he had hoped were subjected to the law of the Lord. He never stayed his course in his journey across the world, until at last.....he laid his head upon that milestone which, they say, was chosen as the block. Such was the zeal of the Apostle, such was his enthusiasm. Are we really uncritical and foolhardy in accepting his testimony as to the Divine nature of that zeal, and of listening to this witness with that veneration his life and his work demand?" [1]

50. How shall we otherwise account for the double phenomenon, interior and exterior, of his conversion? A number of critics in their effort to facilitate the explanation, seek to eliminate the vision, which is nothing more, they say, than an interior enlightenment, probably a legend, a symbol, the mysterious figure under which primitive Christianity pictured the wonderful conversion of the persecutor who became an Apostle. The interior conversion, gradually brought about by the influences to which Paul was subjected, would be the normal outcome of the antecedents of the convert, of his old and bitter experience of the powerlessness of the law to effect the justification of the faithful (Rom. vii.), of the impression made upon him by the discourses and the death of Stephen, by the virtues and patience of the first Christians, and the remorse of a tender conscience which reproached him for having persecuted those who, perhaps, were God's servants. This was the goad against which it was hard to kick.

It is true that such thoughts and impressions might lead a Jew, by degrees, and after a time, to embrace Christianity; but the least sense and care for historical truth do not allow us to apply to St. Paul's case this description of gradual conversion.

[1] Rose, *loc. cit.*

Can we find a witness who is more certain of St. Paul's sentiments than St. Paul himself? He has told us over and over again what his sentiments were before, and subsequent to, his conversion. Circumcised on the eighth day, an Israelite and a Pharisee, he was eager in searching for that justice which comes from the observance of the Law (Philip. iii. 5, 6). If, once he had come under the law of grace, he felt how powerless in comparison was the Law to effect man's sanctification, he had not experienced this previously. He sought then the remedy for the numberless faults he had committed, in the numerous traditional purifications, and showed himself more zealous than all others for the observance of Pharisaic ritual (Gal. i. 14). He was never aware of having once doubted; and it was in all the sincerity of complete ignorance (Tim. i. 13) that he, more than any other (Gal. i. 13), persecuted the Church of God. If he felt the goad at the moment when he was flung to the earth on the way to Damascus, hesitating whether he should surrender, it was altogether a new impression for him. M. Sabatier, who will not be suspected of any leaning towards the supernatural, frankly acknowledges this: "Paul knew nothing, and this is an essential point, of a gradual progress, or a gradual conversion to the Gospel. The memory of his conversion which he preserved all his life, was that of a startling occurrence which had overtaken him in the full vigour of his Judaism, and had flung him, despite himself, on new ways. He had been overcome and subdued by main force (Philip. iii. 12). It was a conquered rebel whom God led in triumph before the people (2 Cor. ii. 14). He may not take any glory to himself for having preached the Gospel. He *must* preach it. It was a necessity from which he could not escape. He was driven to preach as a slave who is in chains (1 Cor. ix. 15-18).[1]

[1] A. Sabatier, L'Apôtre Paul, p. 43 *ap.* P. Protin. *La Genèse de la pensée de Saint* Paul in the *Revue Augustinienne*, 15th February 1908, p. 176.

Nor is St. Paul less explicit concerning the reality of the exterior phenomenon which was one of the factors of his conversion. His testimony does not permit of doubt being thrown on that of his companion, St. Luke, in the Acts. He beheld the Risen Christ in a vision similar to those which the other Apostles had enjoyed: "And last of all he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time" (1 Cor. xv. 8). He qualifies his vision "by an energetic expression which throws into relief the particular manner of his conversion. He was born with violence, as one out of due time. He entered the way of God because he was compelled. While the other Apostles and disciples came to believe in the Risen Jesus after a slow and progressive preparation, he had been snatched before his time from the womb that bore him."[1]

We must believe him. The external phenomenon is an historical datum which is too thoroughly attested to allow of its being excluded.

51. Renan understood this well, and has attempted to give a naturalistic explanation of the phenomenon.[2]

Despite "the extreme delicacy" of his psychological analysis and his "remarkable knowledge of the locality,"[3] he has not succeeded in rendering his solution even plausible. His ingenious scaffolding of hypotheses has caused even the critics themselves to smile. We are not surprised that M. Guignebert should not be entirely satisfied: but we are astonished that he should refer his readers to it; and, since this romance is capable of making an impression upon young people and those who are only half-educated, we shall discuss it.

Renan sees in the lightnings of a sudden and violent storm, the sign from heaven which caused

[1] V. Rose, *art cit.*, p. 327.
[2] *Les Apôtres*, C. X., p. 174 *sq.*
[3] Guignebert. *Hist. anc. du Christ.* C. VIII, p. 294.

in the excited Paul, the hallucination that made him believe he beheld Christ in a vision, and which turned his already disturbed mind to believe in Him whose followers he was persecuting.

This idea of a storm is rather clumsy. There is nothing which less disposes one to entertain hallucinations than the menace of a storm or a torrent of rain even though it comes from the hills of Hermon. Travellers, whether in the East or the West, have but one anxiety at such a moment, and that is to obtain shelter as speedily as possible. The sudden attack of a pernicious fever, the rush of blood to the brain, which always renders those whom it attacks delirious, and would have calmed the frenzy of Saul, might have given M. Renan when he lay sick at Byblos "the impression of a black night, cut by lightning-flashes which helped one to draw images on the black ground"; but once the paroxysm had passed, the most credulous woman of the East as well as a philosopher of the West would have known the value of these fevered impressions if, indeed, she remembered them. Let us say the case was one of simple hallucination. A case already interesting when it concerns a man thirty years of age, of the strength and rational temperament of Saul, who was fatigued by a long journey on foot which, instead of exciting the nervous system, would be rather depressing. Why should this hallucination give rise to dispositions different from those of which the sick have experience, and reverse instead of aggravate the usual sentiments? "We must suppose that some mysterious work was going on within him, perhaps the outcome of deep reflection —ill understood at first—on the gentleness, patience, and courage of those whom he pursued." Be it so, but if we are to accept this conjecture we must dispense with criticism.

The inadvertent reader might believe M. Renan when he says "Paul was beginning to love what he had hitherto held in abhorrence.....He was

subdued by the charms of those he had persecuted. The better he knew these good people, the more he liked them.....each step on the road to Damascus aroused severe perplexities. The hateful part, he played as executioner became insupportable. Perhaps the houses he saw in the distance were the homes of his victims. This thought obsessed him. He went slowly; and, not wishing to go further, he imagined that he was resisting a goad which drove him onwards."[1]

In writing these lines, M. Renan must have forgotten what history had taught him regarding the character of Paul, must have forgotten too, all he has said of his "Dogmatism," a real "garment of Nessus" of which he was unable to divest himself.[2]

Paul assuredly loved these "good people," his Jewish brethren. It may be that he already loved them well enough to write: "I speak the truth that I have a great sadness, and continual sorrow in my heart.....for I wished myself to be an anathema from Christ, for my brethren" (Rom. ix. 1-3): but he loved them neither more nor less than he would the sinner of Corinth later, whose body he would deliver up to Satan "for the destructing of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved" (1 Cor. v. 5).

It was not to Satan that he had delivered his erring brethren of Jerusalem, but to zealous Jewish magistrates, who would know well how to convince them, by stripes as well as by instruction, and the wisdom learnt by reflection in their prison-cells, of the error of their blasphemous doctrine. He had known how to breathe threatenings at Jerusalem, and to fill the prisons in his efforts to disband the assemblies of the sect. It was much easier at Damascus where the followers of the Nazarene were only a handful. They could be brought bound

[1] *Les Apôtres*, pp. 176, 179.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

together, and that would put an end to them. The danger to the Jewish faith would be averted and the honour of Jhahve avenged.

When that end was near its fulfilment Paul exulted at the thought of an easy victory which had been so eagerly desired by him in his zeal for the traditions of his fathers (Gal. i. 15).

It was at this moment he was struck down. So little did he dream of the possibility of meeting the Crucified, that at first he knew not with whom he spoke: "Who art thou, Lord?" "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Immediately there was a complete and sudden upheaval of his beliefs and his love. He was forced to submit. He struggled for a moment. "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad?" continued the Master. He must yield: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Nothing short of a vision of Christ could curb this fiery spirit, and destroy instantaneously all his former convictions, and, leaving his enthusiasm intact, spur him onwards in another direction.

It is quite true that the ardour and sincerity of his faith disposed him to be converted, but it was not by the subconscious increase of obscure reflections which were in total opposition to the development of this new belief. It was by drawing upon this soul, so loyal in its very ignorance, the merciful glance of the Saviour.[1]

[1] We know well that even at the present time, the sincerest and most zealous of our opponents, by reason of their sincerity and the devotedness which they have placed at the service of error, are nearer to God and to ourselves than these so-called "broad minded" people whose picture, as flattering as it is interesting has been sketched by Renan in *Les Apôtres* (p. 183). If the egoists warmly welcome any objection from whatever source it comes in politics as in religion, the reason is that they fear nothing so much as conviction, for this always demands devotedness and sacrifice. Renan is a perfect type of these "sharpers in politics" so well known to M. Guignebert (*Mod. et Trad.*, note p. 3). Unhappily it is not true that "the East never possessed men of this kind" (Renan, p. 183). They are to be found in the East and the West. But the "cold natures" of this kind from whatever country they come, and however obliging they may appear to be to inexperienced ecclesiastics, are always hard to convert, and they seem to be already marked with the seal of reprobation, because they love not.

52. St. Paul's conversion is a puzzle to those who will not accept his testimony as to its supernatural cause. Rationalists themselves are agreed in this point. Reuss says that: "The conversion of St. Paul is not miraculous in the traditional sense of the term.....it is a psychological problem which cannot be solved in our day."[1]

Baur closes his discussion with these words: "We cannot fathom the mystery of the act by which God revealed His Son to Paul, by any analysis or by psychology, or dialectics."[2]

M. Guignebert, in a work which is a little more serious than his latest libel, writes: "The miracle of the way to Damascus has caused as much ink to flow as the Resurrection of Jesus, and with little more result."[3]

Finally, M. Sabatier lets us see the reasons for the denials of rationalistic exegesis. "The question of St. Paul's conversion cannot be fully explained in an isolated way. It is indissolubly connected with the question of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ Himself. The explanation given of the first question depends upon how we explain the second. He who accepts the Resurrection of the Saviour will not be justified in doubting that He appeared to His apostle: but he who *before all examination*, is absolutely certain that God does not exist, or if He does exist, that He does not ever intervene in history, will doubtless brush aside the two facts, and take refuge in the hypothesis of an interior vision, even though such an hypothesis may seem more unlikely. The problem is then taken from the sphere of history into that of metaphysics, and we cannot follow it."[4]

But the desire to escape from the supernatural does not allow us to escape from the mystery. Is

[1] *Epitres Pauliniennes*, p. 11.
[2] *Das Christenthum und die Christliche Kirche*, 3rd ed., p. 45.
[3] *Hist. anc. du Christ*, C. VIII., p. 291.
[4] *L'Apôtre Paul.* 3rd ed., p. 57. All the passages cited from rationalist authors, except that of M. Guignebert, are taken from the above mentioned article of V. Rose, in the *Revue Biblique*, July, 1902, p. 343.

not the mystery attested by St. Paul more luminous than a causeless upheaval of natural influences? And was not the conversion of him who was to become the Apostle of the Gentiles, the prelude and gage of the victories which the Church was to win over the false religions of paganism? Here again we are face to face with the supernatural.

CHAPTER VI.

The Conversion of The Roman Empire.

53.—Facilities afforded by Providence for the spread of Christianity, and the obstacles. 54.—Opposition of the people. 55.—Paganism and the life of the Ancients. 56.—Opposition of the cultured classes. 57.—Opposition of the Imperial Power. 58.—Was persecution a cause of development? 59.—The true cause of the growth of Christianity.

53. "Far from being surprised at the success of Christianity in the Roman Empire, we should rather be astonished that the change was of such slow accomplishment."[1] Renan's desire to destroy what he regarded as the most cogent proofs of the truth of Christianity, has carried him this time beyond the limits of probability.[2]

Such exaggeration in a writer who is usually less assertive, shows that his chief, though unacknowledged, purpose, is to combat the faith he has repudiated. M. Guignebert does not go quite so far, and admits that the struggle between Christianity and the Roman Empire "took a turn which at first seemed quite improbable . . . the State became Christian."[3] It is these improbable characteristics which, from a purely natural point of view are irreducible, that we wish to outline.

[1] *Marc-Aurèle.*, C. XXXI, p. 585; cf. *Les Apôtres.*, C. XVI, p. 303; Eng. trans. Scott Library, p. 289.

[2] "The strongest proofs of religion are evidently in its foundation." *Notes inédites de Renan*, written when he was a seminarist in Saint-Sulpice, and published by the *Revue Bleue*, Jan. 4, 1908, and the *Bulletin de la Semaine*, Jan. 15, 1908. This conviction of his when a seminarist explains why Renan, having lost all faith, devoted his life to the study of the origins of Christianity.

[3] *Hist. Anc. du Christ*, Introduction, p. x.

No one may deny the favourable conditions offered by the Roman Empire and Roman civilisation to the development of Christianity. The *pax Romana*, the facilities for intercourse all around the Mediterranean, the diffusion of the Greek language which was everywhere spoken and everywhere understood, the order maintained by the police who frequently protected the Christian communities against the Synagogues, offered material assistance to the preaching of the Gospel for which the early missionaries, and St. Paul especially, were deeply grateful to Roman administration.

Greek thought, whose perfection arose from its being so universally human, and not because it was associated with this or that system of philosophy, became the happy medium of furnishing meanings and words for the analytical exposition of the supernatural realities of the Gospel which were wanting to Semitic modes of thought and speech. Philosophy had thrown discredit upon the official cults amongst the lettered classes without suppressing the need of religion which is inherent in human nature. The Stoics, concurrently with the disciples of Jesus, preached an ethical code which so closely resembled that of Christianity that one may ask if Seneca and Epictetus had not read the Gospel. But nothing of this is sufficient to render probable the hypothesis of a purely natural evolution of the mustard seed of the Gospel which so speedily became a great tree. We cannot explain, even if this evolution be granted, how the Catholic Church, already so wonderfully established yet apparently so weak when St. Peter and St. Paul cemented its foundations with their blood, was able to overcome the conjoint opposition of the people, the leisured class, and the State; how she came to impose the worship of a Crucified Jew upon Graeco-Roman pride; and the obligatory ideal of Gospel morality upon Graeco-Roman corruption; and amidst all her trials, how she was able to strengthen her internal

unity, to develop her organisation, and to weed out those corrupt sects which arose in almost every quarter and which were brought into existence by spirits that were agitated by the leaven of the Gospel.

54. The greatest number of the first converts to Christianity came from the ranks of the lower classes (1 Cor. i. 26). But we should be wrong in concluding that the Christian propaganda was a democratic movement, or that the association of the lower classes made for their triumph over the grinding tyranny of the wealthy. The people were as greatly opposed to the new religion as the aristocracy, and they began the persecution before the State. Everywhere he went St. Paul experienced the brutal hostility of the idol-worshipping rabble which Jewish emissaries excited by denouncing the new sect for seeking to destroy the worship of the gods, and inflamed still further by accusing the Christians of abominable crimes. It was the populace that drove St. Paul from Antioch of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 51), from Iconium (xiv. 6), from Lystra (xiv. 19), from Philippi (xvi. 19-24), from Thessalonica (xvii. 13), and Ephesus (xix. 23-24). So deeply-seated and notorious was the hatred of the Romans for the Christians, "enemies of the human race"[1] that after the burning of Rome Nero believed he could appease the anger of the populace by delivering the Christians in a body to those terrific tortures which history has recorded.

It was Nero, most probably, who proclaimed in Roman law that Christianity was expressly forbidden as "an illicit cult,"[2] but in doing this, he merely applied the principles of Roman law and yielded to public opinion. During the first two

[1] Tacitus, Annales, XV. 44.

[2] Mgr. Duchesne. *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise.* C. VII. Paris, 1907. Vol. I, p. 112: Paul Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain.* C. I. Paris, 1905: *1 Ep. of St. Peter,* iv. 12-16.

centuries we find that the carrying out of this prohibition of the State was left to the denunciation of private individuals or to that of the populace; and they were the more or less zealous in this work in so far as they found a governor who was a more or less zealous pagan, or that the calamities of the times stirred up idolatrous fanaticism against the "atheists" whose impiety was the cause of every public woe. If these persecutions were neither so violent nor so widespread as those of the Emperors, who, from the beginning of the third century took the initiative in these matters we need not have any illusions as to their rigour or the number of victims. We give here the testimony of Renan.

"From Nero to Commodus, except for short intervals, we may say that the Christian lived with the spectacle of torture always before his eyes. Martyrdom is the basis of Christian apologetics. In the controversial language of the time it is the sign of the truth of Christianity . . . And in fact, according to Tertullian, persecution was the natural atmosphere of the Christian at this period. The details of the *Acts of the Martyrs* may be, in large measure, false; but the harrowing picture they put before us is none the less true. Misleading descriptions of this terrific struggle with which the beginnings of Christianity were surrounded as with a brilliant aureole, and which have branded the best centuries of the Empire with a blood-red sign, have frequently been given; but the gravity of the situation has not been exaggerated. Persecution was a chief factor in the formation of this great society of men which was the first to have its rights victorious over the tyrannical pretensions of the State." [1]

[1] *L'Eglise Chrétienne.* C. XVI, p. 316. In the preceding pages Renan gives the reasons for his conclusions. "While criticism shows that there are some things in the *Acts of the Martyrs* which are untrustworthy, it has sometimes gone to the other extreme. Documents which at first were accepted as the original acts of the processes of the martyrs

55. The duration and violence of this popular opposition to the spread of Christianity is sufficient proof of the hold which idolatry had taken on the people. We are too much inclined to judge the case in a Christian spirit, or in the light of the writings of a few philosophers who were not generally read, whose teachings were at variance with the conduct of their authors, and who did not wholly escape the

having been found to be for the most part apocryphal; the texts of historians which dealt with the persecutions being rare and brief, and the summaries of Roman legislation having little to say on the question, it was only natural that great reserve should be shown. We may be tempted to imagine that the persecutions were not really of much account, that the number of the martyrs was not great, and that on this point every ecclesiastical system is but an artificial construction. The truth came gradually. Even when legendary exaggeration has been done away with, these persecutions remain as one of the darkest pages of history and are the disgrace of ancient civilisation..... With "the Epistle concerning the death of Polycarp which contains a narrative of the sufferings of the heroes of Lyons, the Acts of the African Martyrs and a few narratives which are of the gravest character.....the real documents which refer to the persecution the Church had to face, are the works which compose the literature of primitive Christianity .....The first Epistle attributed to St. Peter, the Apocalypse of St. John, the fragment known as the *Epistle* of Barnabas, the *Epistle* of Clement of Rome even if it should not be his, the completely or partially apocryphal epistles of St. Ignatius and of Polycarp, the Sybiline oracles, which belong to the first and second centuries, all the original pieces that Eusebius has preserved for us which relate to the origin of Montanism, the controversies of the Montanists and Gnostics on martyrdom, *the Pastor* of Hermas, the *Apologies* of Aristides, Quadratus, St. Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, all of them reveal on each page a period of violence which oppresses the writer, obsesses him in a sense, and does not permit him to appreciate the situation justly." (pp. 314-316) Renan, moreover, was cognisant of the testimony of Origen who replied to Celsus that no one can say the Christians were abandoned by God, because the martyrs, whose heroic deaths were permitted as an example for the edification of others, were not so numerous that they could not be counted, for the Spirit of God tempered the hatred of rulers and people so that the community was not utterly blotted out. *Cont. Cels.* III 8. P.L., Vol. XI, col. 929. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Feb., 15, 1886, p. 816, M. Gaston Boissier upholds Renan's opinion, and confronts the solitary testimony of Origen with the evidence of all the other Fathers, and that of Origen's contemporary, Clement of Alexandria: "Each day we behold the blood of the faithful who are burnt alive, crucified or beheaded, flowing

powerful influence of religious customs. The theology of paganism, it is true, was a poor thing generally, but its festivities were brilliant and seductive. Under the many more or less ancient forms of polytheism, the worship of nature and its mysterious powers remained ever vital. "The ode to the sun which gives life to every living thing filled Goethe with a religious eloquence and made him a Sun-Worshipper. How must this hymn have uplifted men at a time when science had not as yet driven this divinity from the world!"[1] Moreover, paganism offered to those who desired a deeper religious sentiment and thought, its mysteries with their esoteric teachings for the initiated, its Eastern rites, and the cult of Mithra specially. The latter like Christianity possessed its sacraments, its mediator, its redemption, its asceticism, its resurrection, its final judgment, its hell and heaven, and by means of a syncretism which permitted of its being harmonized with national cults, and which won for it imperial favours, seemed destined to supplant the religion of Jesus. Side by side with public worship there existed a domestic religion. "In all the provinces and towns, in Rome and in Alexandria, in Spain, Asia and Egypt, each house, each family had its idols, its customs, superstitions, and domestic ritual of all kinds. The literature of the time rarely notices the fact; but the gems, the mortuary chambers, and papyri of the

in streams," and the evidence of Celsus himself in reference to the Christians: "If two or three amongst you still live, wanderers or in hiding, you are sought out everywhere to be dragged to execution." He concludes: "even if we suppose that but a few victims suffered each time and in each locality, the number, taken together, of those who suffered was considerable." Harnack in his work *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jarhunderten,* first Edition. Leipzig, 1902, p. 345, examines the question of the comparatively small number of the martyrs, and bases his argument on the testimony of Origen, but acknowledges that "the sword of Damocles was hanging over the head of each Christian," M. Paul Allard well defends the traditional opinion in his volume *Dix leçons sur le martyre,* pp. 134-149.

[1] Harnack. *L'Essence du Christianisme,* p. 206.

magicians let us into the secret. We learn that each domestic function possessed its tutelary genius, and that every action was subject to the guidance of a god. The religious world remained intact, and this secondary worship was everywhere vital and active."[1]

56. If the discredit which some philosophers cast upon the paganism that was so intimately bound up with every public function and festival, as well as with family life, had been sufficient to drive men to embrace Christianity, the leisured classes, we take it, would have been the first to enter the Church. But it was just the cultured class, the followers of the philosophers, and the philosophers themselves who showed the most determined opposition to Christianity. The Stoics under their disciple Marcus Aurelius, took the lead in the recrudescence of persecution. The Neo-Platonicians with Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jambilicus did their utmost to save the already tottering paganism, by constructing a philosophico-religious synthesis by means of myths which were interpreted in a philosophical sense, some elements of which were not wholly valueless. The lettered class turned Julian from Christianity to paganism and made him a persecuting apostate. Nor had Lactantius no cause to fear for the faith of certain Christians in the time of Constantine, because of the danger they ran in frequenting "philosophers, orators, and poets,"[2] and to complain that, with the exception of the *Octavius* which he considered insufficient, and the writings of Cyprian which he regarded as too theological for ordinary people, there was no really Christian literature. "Learning remained pagan until the middle of the IV Century,"[3] and when the educated classes abandoned paganism to become Christians they were only a little in advance of the last of the labouring people. It is

[1] Harnack. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, p. 211.
[2] *Institutiones divinae*. L.V.C.I. P.L., Vol. VI, col. 549.
[3] Harnack. *Op. cit.*, p. 357.

quite true, however, that then as now, intellectual culture made for a better understanding of the superiority of Christian dogma and ethics. But it is also true that, then as now, this dogmatic and ethical teaching imposed certain obligations which a more elevated doctrine, however attractive, did not suffice to make acceptable to the independent spirit of philosophers and the super-refinement of the cultured class. To them more than to any others, did the mystery of the Cross appear foolish.

57. We need scarcely insist upon the opposition which Christianity met with at the hands of Imperial power. The Emperors looked favourably on those religious whose facile syncretism did not exclude official worship, and in particular the worship of Rome and Augustus. They had even dispensed the Jews from taking part in idolatrous worship, and merely demanded that they should pray for the Emperor. Jewish propagandism, strictly limited by the exigencies of the Mosaic law, did not appear so dangerous that they should run the risk of having to face serious trouble by abolishing ancient privileges. But it was very different when Christianity was in question. Public authority could not, without breaking with the most deeply rooted traditions of Rome, permit a form of Judaism to be preached which aimed at drawing to itself the citizens of the Empire, and of utterly destroying the State religion. All that Christianity was expected to do that it might obtain authorisation, was to accept the worship of the Emperors. "The Church betrayed no weakness in the matter. She put a stop to the worship of the Emperors. The blood of the martyrs flowed so copiously that it placed an impassable gulf between religion and politics, between God and Caesar."[1] After having proscribed Christianity from the beginning as a crime punishable by death, the State did not at first consider that it ought to depart from

[1] Harnack. *L'Essence du Christianisme*, p. 206.

the customs of Roman law, and, until the third century, left the denunciation of the Christians, as it left the denunciation of other criminals, to the people. At that epoch, however, the State discovered that this method of procedure did not prevent the rapid spread of the proscribed religion. Popular resistance had been partially overcome. The Christians had become so numerous and so well known, that the infamous calumnies of which they had been the victims in former times, no longer gained credence. Their associations were now so powerful as to necessitate the direct and active intervention of the State. The regime of intermittent toleration, and of persecutions by Edict, as violent as they were general, had taken the place, during the third and in the first years of the fourth century, of the regime of continued persecution, even though it had been confined to certain localities, and at times had been rather slack. This time there can be no doubt as to the great number of martyrs: neither can there be any doubt in regard to the large numbers of timorous souls who apostatized through fear of torture, or of the danger arising from the divisions which were caused amongst the faithful by their reception once more within the bosom of the Church. Yet, the Church emerged victorious from these terrible trials. Even before Constantine had fixed the Labarum to the Imperial Standards, Galerius, the most active agent of the last persecution, had issued an Edict in which he proclaimed that, having failed to win over the Christians to the traditional religion of Rome, he permitted them to reassemble for the purpose of adoring their God, and besought them to pray for his welfare: *Debebunt Deum suum exorare pro salute nostra.*[1]

58. The end of the struggle was at hand. The spread of Christianity had not been stayed, either

[1] Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, n. 34, P.L., Vol. VII, col. 249.

by the opposition of the populace, or by that of the educated classes, or by imperial authority. Was it to become a law in history that: "Everywhere, a religion which is oppressed, will grow and increase without hinderance, and that persecution is a powerful factor for its propagation?"[1]

Harnack is not the only one who asserts this, but a number of historical facts are against it. It is very true that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of Christianity, and that the courage shown by the confessors of the faith brought about many conversions; but the Church knew full well that, but for the help of extraordinary grace, persecution was a more prolific cause of apostacy than of conversion. The severity of the inquisition uprooted the Cathari in Southern France and the Moriscoes in Spain. Mussulman tyranny perverted North-West Africa and several Oriental races; and everyone is aware of the havoc wrought by the Chinese and Japanese persecutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. If persecution is to be a means of propagating the faith, those who suffer must needs possess a supernatural power such as God has not assured even to His Church in every age and in every country. He was generous of such assistance in the beginning in order to make the expansion of Christianity certain, for how otherwise shall we account for that expansion?

59. "Did Christianity spread with surprising swiftness?" asks Harnack; and he replies: "Though we do not possess sufficient documentary evidence to permit a comparison with the other religions of the Empire, I nevertheless reply to the question in the affirmative. The Fathers of the fourth century, such as Arnobius, Eusebius, and Augustine, are convinced that the faith spread with a rapidity which is incomprehensible. This conviction still holds, and with good reason. Seventy years after the

[1] Harnack. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*, p. 345.

first community of convert pagans had been established at Antioch, Pliny described in forcible language the expansion of Christianity in the far off province of Bithynia, and already beholds in it a menace to the other religions of that country. Seventy years later, the Paschal controversy reveals a confederation of Christian Churches stretching from Lyons to Odessa and having its centre at Rome. Another seventy years and we find the Emperor Decius protesting that he would prefer a rival claimant at Rome to a Christian Bishop. Before another seventy years the Cross was fixed to the Roman Standards."[1] As a reason of this wonderful expansion we may assign, if not the syncretism[2] of Christian doctrine which was too limited and too exclusive to be very fascinating, at least the disciplinary organisation of the Church, the attraction which her monotheism had for certain souls, her hopes of immortality, and the constant practice of charity and mutual assistance by her children. Yet, this attractiveness, if it had been merely natural, would never have sufficed to win thousands of pagans from nature-worship, State-religion, their past, their families and friends, public life, and the corrupting influence of the time,[3] to bring them, at constant risk of fortune and life, to adore a Crucified Jew, and to impose upon them, as a condition of their hope of blessedness for which they had already paid so dearly, a morality which was oppressively trying to a converted pagan, a manner of life which, always austere, must have seemed doubly

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 546.

[2] This syncretism, in which Harnack places the principal strength of Christianity, was limited to the acceptance of those pagan ceremonies whose natural symbolism was capable of expressing Christian sentiment. If we add to this the skill which Christian dogma possessed of expressing itself in the terms of Greek philosophy, a work which was only in its infancy during the period of persecution, we shall not on that account come to attribute to the religion of Christ, so exclusive in its teachings, a natural power of attractiveness which was equal to that exercised by the still greater syncretism of certain forms of paganism.

[3] We shall see later the extent of pagan corruption, when we discuss the influence of the Church on morality. C. XI, n. 102.

gloomy at a period when practically every worldly pleasure was forbidden as idolatrous or impure. For the Church to win over and hold so many of the faithful under such conditions nothing less was required than the supernatural breath of the Spirit of Jesus. It is by means of this Divine assistance that she became the Universal Church, that she has preserved the purity of her doctrine intact, while she assimilated all that was good and of worth in those religions which she condemned. It was, in truth, "because she placed the Cross upon all that was human,"[1] upon everything that was really good for man, that the Church succeeded. Yet, while this conquest was the work of the Spirit of God, the divine Grace of the Crucified was necessary that the human, signed with the Cross, should preserve its beauty.

[1] Harnack. *Loc. cit.*

CHAPTER VII.

The Church and Primitive Sects.

60.—Dangers arising from the Primitive Sects. 61.—The law of Salvation. 62.—Episcopacy necessary for the Church. 63.—Necessity of a central authority. 64.—The Primacy of Rome: St. Clement's testimony. 65.—The testimony of St. Ignatius of Antioch. 66.—The witness of fact 67.—St. Victor and the Paschal Controversy. 68.—The exercise of the Primacy is restricted. 69.—The "real miracles of Primitive Christianity" according to Renan.

60. While she successfully combated paganism the Catholic Church had also to struggle, and from the beginning, to preserve her unity, and the doctrine she had been commissioned to teach to all nations. St. Paul was not astonished at the differences of opinion which arose in Corinth, he knew that these sects were necessary for the trial of the faithful (1 Cor. xi. 19.) The Gospel is a leaven (Matt. xiii. 33-34). The mysterious truths it proclaimed gave rise to theological speculation that was not only arbitrary but destructive in regard to Gospel data when a spirit of humility and purity of heart did not wholly consecrate the theologian's mind to God. Nor was there less danger (to be feared) from excitable mystics who looked upon the suggestions of their sickly sensibility as the voice of the Spirit; from rigorists who would only take the sanctity of God into account without considering His mercy; and from those various dissenters who had no sooner taken upon them the Gospel yoke than they were up in arms against every disciplinary and dogmatic law which thwarted them.

This temper existed from the very days of the preaching of the Apostles. St. Paul inveighed not only against the upholders of Jewish observances, but also against those theorists who corrupted his teaching on the pretext of perfecting it (Col. ii.). The Pastoral Epistles mention by name (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 18), some of those ravening wolves of whom the Apostle spoke to the bishops of Asia in his last visit to Ephesus (Acts xx. 29), and give us an idea of their errors. In the letters to the seven Churches of the Apocalypse we find the same solicitude in guarding the faithful against false teachers, and it was the absorbing pre-occupation of the Johannine Epistles, of the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter, as also of the Epistle of St. Jude. These false teachers found numerous followers. The sects brought into existence by the disturbance which the Gospel leaven caused were many. The most numerous, designated under the general term of Gnosticism, gave themselves over to the abuses of philosophico-religious speculation; but equally dangerous were those who sided with Marcion in his opposition to the Old Testament, who were followers of the illuminism of Montanus, the rigorism of the Encratites and of Tatian, and that of Novatian, etc...

61. Celsus grows sarcastic over the divisions which seemed to incorporate in the Church the various sects that claimed to come from Christ;[1] but the divisions were not within the Church, they were alongside her. In his reply to this philosopher, Origen appeals to the law of salvation, the uncompromising character of which is the strength and unity of Catholicity: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid" (Tit. iii. 10). We have already seen[2] that there was a rule of faith. The teaching of the

[1] Origen. *Contra Celsum*, L.V., n. 63, P.G., Vol. XI, col. 1284.

[2] Ch. III, n. 35.

Pastoral Epistles as to the duty of bishops in regard to the preservation of the deposit of the faith (1 Tim. vi. 20), was no novelty. It came from the Apostles themselves. If it is so frequently alluded to in these Epistles[1] it is because the necessity of applying that teaching became more apparent. It is not true that the evolution of gnostic dreams brought into being the formation of a rule of faith and a hierarchy, things unknown in earlier days. What is true, is that the increasing number of false teachers necessitated a more frequent appeal to this rule of faith, a more energetic intervention of authority, and a more intimate and more loyal intercourse amongst the various communities.

62. What was this authority? Was it everywhere as at Jerusalem, a monarchical Episcopate? Or, did it consist of a college of priest-bishops under a president? These questions belong to theology and history. The Apologist is content to know that there was authority, a fact which is indisputable. St. Paul appointed presbyters or bishops at Corinth and other places. We cannot deny this statement because he does not treat the subject in his Epistles, since thirty years after his death, St. Clement of Rome appealed to this fact, which was well known to the Corinthians, to demand their submission to the presbyters as the legitimate depositaries of the authority which had been bestowed by the Apostles.[2]

"The first Christian communities were governed at the outset by apostles of various degrees, to whom they owed their foundation, and by other members of the evangelizing staff . . . . Whether they (the first communities) had one bishop at their head, or whether they had a college of several, the Episcopate still carried on the Apostolic succession. It is equally

[1] 1 Tim. i. 3-8, 18-20; iv. 1-7; vi. 3-5; II. 20-21; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 14-18; iii. 1-10, 14-17; iv. 1-5; Tit. i. 9-16; ii. 1; iii. 10.

[2] *I. Epitre de St. Clément aux Corinthiens*, C. I., 42-44, P. G. t. 1, col. 208, 292, 297.

clear that, through the Apostles who had instituted it, this hierarchy went back to the very beginning of the Church, and derived its authority from those to whom Jesus Christ had entrusted His work."[1]

It was the Episcopate which saved Christianity from the inevitable destruction to which it seemed doomed on account of the discussion of those formidable questions that Gospel teaching raised in curious minds, as well as by reason of the increasing number of its adherents, some of whom were not remarkable for sanctity. Everyone is agreed on this point. "It is undeniable," says Renan, "that without the Episcopate, the Churches which had been united for the moment by the remembrance of Jesus would have become disjoined; divergence of doctrine, difference in imaginative outlook, and above all, rivalry and discontent would have brought about endless disunion and disintegration. Christianity would have ceased to exist after three or four centuries, like the worship of Mithra and countless other cults which were not empowered to conquer time"[2] Harnack, while he regrets what seems to him to be a corruption of the substance of Christianity, makes Renan's words his own: "Mediocrity gave rise to authority," and is forced to admit that, "the original enthusiasm" having disappeared in accordance with the general law of the history of all known religions, Christianity required legislation and a hierarchy to defend itself against Gnosticism. And M. Guignebert only echoes the opinions of Renan and Harnack when he writes: "It was not long before the Christian Community had to suffer from mediocrity, from men without enthusiasm, without religious energy, who were incapable of accepting a faith which had no guarantee of authority. It was also the prey of tumultuous spirits who disturbed the

[1] Duchesne—*Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*, C. VII, Vol. I, p. 66. English translation, London, 1910. The question of the origin of the Episcopate is dealt with in this chapter in a brief but masterly way.

[2] *L'Eglise Chretienne*, C. VI, pp. 91-92.

peaceful anarchy which obtained in the beginning. If the Church had not been in existence then, Christianity could not have lived."[1]

We are not surprised that unbelievers have recognized the need of a rule of faith and a hierarchy to preserve Christianity. This truth is not only Catholic teaching, it is that of common sense. Religion is not made for a few superior minds but for the whole mass, and must supply the needs of a large number whom daily toil and the ordinary limitations of human nature condemn to inevitable mediocrity whether as regards knowledge or sentiment. Moreover, the superior beings stand in as much, perhaps in greater, need of a rule of Christian life, as ordinary people. The more energetic the spirit, the more zealous the heart, the greater is the necessity for a rule which shall prevent the inevitable mistakes of an insatiable curiosity and impetuous enthusiasm to which the mysteries of the truths of the Gospel and its urging towards perfection might give rise. Valentinus, Marcion, Tatian, Montanus and Tertullian were not ordinary people. Without a rule of faith and a hierarchy, Christianity, with its teachings, however elementary we may suppose them to be, concerning realities that were beyond the test of experience, could not have had any better fate than that which has befallen the most brilliant systems of philosophy. It would have been condemned to the indefinite avatars of many Protestant sects. The Christian who rejects all dogmatic authority is in great danger of losing that knowledge of the Father which Harnack would try to save when the other beliefs of his co-religionists have been shipwrecked. Having denied the divinity of Christ, he will soon cease to be His disciple, and will no longer regard Christianity as anything more than a very curious historical phenomenon, but not a source of life, at least to him.

[1] *Hist. Anc. du Christ*, p. 232.

Christianity, therefore, could only be preserved by the Episcopate; but the Episcopate accomplished its task by union, and this union could not have been maintained except by means of the supernatural assistance of the Man-God Who willed it.

The authority of any single bishop would have been powerless to protect the faith of his subjects against the corruptions of Gnosticism, if the false teacher whom he condemned had been received and welcomed in the neighbouring community. It would have been fatal to Christianity if the deposit of doctrine had been at the mercy of a man whose judgment might be warped by error as we so frequently find is the case. Hence it was absolutely necessary that there should be not only bishops but an Episcopate, a body of bishops, who should give the self-same teaching, should be united in one and the same communion of Charity, in one and the same "agape" to use the language of the time, and be able to weed out, to excommunicate in a manner that had force in the whole Christian world, those brethren whose teaching was false or dangerous, even though they should be bishops themselves.

63. Something more, however, was required to preserve this corporate unity in the Catholic Church, composed as it was of so many Christian communities dispersed throughout the world from Cappadocia and Bithynia to far off Spain, and which was ever increasing in numbers, than collections of Apostolic letters sent from one church to another, or the interchange of letters between neighbouring communities. A centre was required where the union of these provincial communities should find its completion. In the beginning, the Mother Church of Jerusalem and the Apostles had been this centre. The Jewish War and the destruction of the Holy City prevented all opposition to the transference of influence which took place to the profit of Rome. St. Peter, the undisputed Head of the College of

Apostles; St. Paul, the founder of so many Christian communities in the East, were martyred in Rome. Providence had its designs. The capital of the Empire, the centre to which every route by land or sea converged, Rome was better adapted than any other city to be the ecclesiastical capital also, to which the disputes that threatened Catholic unity should be brought as to a Court of Final Appeal. This was what occurred. The Church over which Peter ruled at the time of his martyrdom inherited his authority.

64. The oldest Christian document that we possess,—except the New Testament—shows us that such authority was exercised. The people of Corinth did not appeal against the command given them by the Roman Church about the year 97. On the contrary, so loyally was it accepted, that they included the letter amongst those writings which, together with the Scriptures, were read in the assemblies on Sunday.[1]

While the tone of the Epistle is most fatherly it is also singularly authoritative. "Let those understand who will not receive what Jesus says by Our mouth, that they will commit sin and expose themselves to grave danger: We at least shall be guiltless

[1] *M. Loisy* expresses the following opinion regarding this letter:—"The Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians is written in the name of the Roman Church, and the personality of the writer is not obtruded; but the letter was received and preserved as the Epistle of Clement who was its responsible author and the official mouthpiece of the community. The same Epistle shows us that the Roman Church took an interest in the internal life of distant communities and considered that it possessed the right to interfere in that life authoritatively. Paul could not have spoken more forcibly to those Corinthians who were at variance than Clement, even though it appears that it was the community, the heir of apostolic tradition that spoke, and not the personal successor of Peter. This distinction is accessory, for it is the same idea of authority that we find in Clement who speaks in the name of the Church of which he is the ruler and representative, as we find in Victor, Calixtus, and Stephen, who (at a later date) spoke in their own name and as men who occupied the position of the Apostle Peter." *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, p. 143.

of this crime, and shall continue to beseech God to preserve the number of His elect in the world."[1]

65. Ten years later we have the testimony of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who was martyred at Rome under Trajan, about 107. The Epistles he has left to us obtained such vogue in the Primitive Church, that they gave rise to an entire apocryphal literature which, while parading under the name of Ignatius, did not, however, succeed in compromising the real Epistles. No one at the present day disputes the integrity and authenticity of the first seven Epistles. The language puts those who would like to find that the organisation of the hierarchy was wrapped in obscurity for a much longer time, in bad humour, since, to uphold the hypothesis of a state of anarchy in the early days of the Church, they find it necessary to presuppose that a radical change took place with surprising swiftness in the regime of the communities. "Ignatius," says Guignebert, "is a frantic episcopalian."[2] M. Wernle sums up his teaching as follows :—"Never did man speak in a more extravagant manner in reference to the ecclesiastical importance of the bishop, than Ignatius: 'Where the Shepherd is, follow him as sheep' (*Ad Philadel.*, ii. 1). Wherever the bishop is, there should the community be, just as the *Catholic Church* is where Jesus Christ is" (*Ad Smyrnaeos*, viii. 2). "There is no Church apart from the bishop, priests and deacons" (*Ad Trallianos*, iii. 1), "All who belong to Jesus Christ, are in union with the bishop" (*Ad Philadel.*, iii. 2). The practical consequence of this apotheosis is the command which is uniformly given throughout his Epistles: "Do nothing without the bishops."[3] Whosoever does anything without the

[1] This text is not in Migne's edition, but it is to be found in the critical edition of the Fathers by Gebhart and Harnack, LIX. 1. (*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*) Ed. II*a* Leipzig. 1876, fasc. Ius., pars I*a*.

[2] *Hist. anc. du Christ*, C. XIII, p. 513.

[3] *Ad Magnesios*, vii. 1; *Ad Trallianos*, ii. 2; *Ad Philadelphenses*, vii. 2; *Ad Smyrnaeos*, viii. 1.

bishop, serves the devil.....One Body of Christ only, one chalice, one Altar, and so also one bishop with the presbyters and deacons (*Ad Philadel.*, iv). "Thus," says M. Wernle rather spitefully, "thus speaks the first representative of clericalism."[1] The worst of the matter is that these letters, written seventy years after the death of Christ, regard the Episcopate, not as a new, but as an institution already old. The teaching of Ignatius, which seems so extravagant to M. Wernle, was so fully in keeping with the ideas of the churches at the time, that his letters were esteemed as highly as the apostolic writings.

But the holy martyr not only bears witness to the place occupied by the bishop in the Church, which is called by him for the first time *Catholic*, and to the intimate and frequent communication which existed between churches of the same province;[2] he also speaks of the Primacy of Rome. He greets the Church "which reigns in the country of the Romans".....which presides over the Agape.[3] What do these words mean? In this letter and in others also, Ignatius sends the greetings of the "agapes," that is, of the local fraternities: "The agape of the Smyrniotes and the Ephesians greet you.....My heart and the agape of the Churches which have welcomed me, greet you.....The agape of the brethren of Troas greets you."[4] Was not just this undetermined agape—the whole Christian brotherhood presided over by the Roman Church and welded together by its bond of unity? The term *agape* also means charity; but

[1] *Die Anfange unserer Religion*. 2nd Ed., p. 427. We take the passage from the excellent article by M. Labourt, *La Notion Catholique de L'Eglise*, in the *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*, 1st Janvier, 1906.

[2] *Ad Philad.*, xi.; *Ad Smyr.*, xi. 2; *Ad Polycarpum.*, vii. 2; P.G., t. v., col. 705, 716, 725.

[3] Title of the *Epistle to the Romans*, P.G., t. v., col. 685.

[4] *Ad Trallianos*, xiii. 1; *Ad Romanos*, ix. 3; *Ad Philadel.*, xi. 2; *Ad Smyrnaeos*, xii. 1, P.G., t. v., col. 684, 696, 705, 717.

to preside over charity does not only mean to be conspicuous in charity, it means to promote the practice of it by guaranteeing the living unity of the body of which it is the head. It is from Rome that doctrine comes, as it is there that one is sure to find the faith in all its purity: "You have never deceived any, you have instructed all. It is my ardent desire that whatsoever you have prescribed shall remain unquestioned."[1]

66. We have laid stress on the evidence of Clement and Ignatius because, though it is not the most explicit, it is, after that of the Gospel, the oldest. As time went on and the Church grew, the principle of supreme authority, established by Our Lord, inculcated by the Gospels, witnessed to by the earliest Christian documents, became stronger by frequent and unshaken application, ever making for that practice of it which obtains to-day. We shall instance briefly these attestations to such authority which history has recorded.

It was because of their Roman origin that the honour of having them read in Church was paid to the Epistle of Clement and the Pastor of Hermas, an honour not shown to any other non-Apostolic document. From Rome came the Symbol of Faith, that was used in all the Churches, those of the West certainly,[2] and which was recited before Baptism, that Symbol of the Apostles, to which additions were soon made even in Rome itself, yet which was everywhere radically the same. The chief men of the

[1] *Ad Romanos*, iii. 1, P.G. t. v., col. 688. We may consult with profit the works of Duchesne, *Eglises Séparées*, C. IV, *L'Eglise romaine avant Constantin*, p. 127, *sq.*, Tixeront, *La Théologie anténicéenne*, C. III, p. 142, for the comments on this testimony.

[2] The Protestant Kattenbusch, the continuator of Caspari the Swede, is of opinion that the Roman Symbol was the basis of the primitive formularies of the Eastern Churches *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Altkirchlichen Taufsymbols*, Giessen, 1892. Bardenhewer, however, does not believe that any definite pronouncement can be made on the subject at present. *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur*. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1902, Vol. I, p. 72.

Christian world, St. Justin from Grecian Palestine, Hegesippus,[1] who hailed from Syriac-Palestine, Tatian of Assyria, Abercius Marcellus from Phrygia, St. Polycarp of Smyrna, Origen from Alexandria, made a point of visiting the Roman Church to learn her teaching and her discipline.[2] The heretics Marcion Valentinus,[3] Montanus,[4] sought to win her authorisation.[5] Irenæus, only expresses the common opinion, and gives the testimony borne by facts, when he writes about A.D. 180, that the teaching of the Roman Church, "most venerable and best known of all, founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles Peter and Paul,....is quite sufficient to confute those who are....strangers to the truth," and that any Church which claims to be of Apostolic origin is of necessity in union with that Church so renowned for its pre-eminent authority.[6]

67. The history of the Paschal controversy in which Irenæus took part about the year 196, furnishes a striking commentary on these words. The Roman

[1] The journey of Hegesippus is particularly interesting since he, a Judæo-Christian of Palestine, about A.D. 160, visited a number of Churches along the Mediterranean, spent twenty years in Rome, everywhere studying the doctrine which he defended against heretical assaults, and finding that he was in perfect accord with all the bishops he visited. Eusebius. *Hist. Eccl.*, iv., 22, P.G., t. xx, col. 377.

[2] Duchesne. *Eglises Séparées*, p. 136. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, p. 71.

[3] Eusebius. *Hist. Eccl.*, iv., 10, 11, P.G., t. xx., col. 328, 329.

[4] Tertullian. *Adversus Praxeam*, i., P.L., t. ii., col. 178.

[5] "Rome was the goal for most of the Christians with whose journeys we are acquainted," says Harnack, and he gives in support of his statement the names of twenty-five notable Christians of the II. and III. Centuries who came from long distances to visit the Roman Church. Having enumerated the Letters of various Roman Pontiffs to distant Churches, he concludes: "In fact, until the time of Constantine, and, in any case, until about the middle of the III. Century, the centripetal tendencies were stronger than the centrifugal. But Rome was always the centre of these tendencies. *The Roman community* was the catholic community; it was not merely the symbol and representation (die Repräsentantin) of unity; it is to Rome before all others that unity is due (*ihr, vor allem verdankt man die Einheit*)." *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*, pp. 269-272.

[6] Quoniam valde longum est....omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae, eam quam habet ab Apostolis Traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes,

Church celebrated Easter on the Sunday after 14th Nisan, while the Asiatic Churches of Ephesus and its environs, observed the feast like the Jews on the 14th itself.[1] Pope Victor considered that this liturgical discordance, which at first had been tolerated, was dangerous on account of the Judaeo-heretical interpretations that certain Asiatics in Rome gave to it.[2] Victor, having summoned the bishops of the various provinces of Christendom to assemble, and having received from all parts, except from the province of Asia declarations to the effect that the Roman usage was everywhere observed, wished to impose it upon the Asiatics. They, however, were determined to observe the usage they had received from St. John, and Victor wrote that they were to be regarded as ex-communicate (*ἀκοινωνήτους*). St. Irenæus warmly defended the Churches of his native country, and exhorted the Pope as earnestly as possible (*προσηκόντως*) not to destroy the Catholic unity of entire Churches that were otherwise so loyal, because of their attachment to a usage so venerable in its origin and which had been tolerated by his predecessors. At the request of Irenæus many other bishops united their protestations with his.[3] Eusebius does not inform us of the result: and while it is probable that Pope Victor

confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam, vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio." *Contra Haereses.* i. 111, C. III, 2. P.G., Vol. VII, col. 848. (*Cf.* Article "Pope" in the Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XII; and the article by the Rev. Bruno Walkley, O.P., The *Testimony of St. Irenaeus in Favour of the Roman Primacy,* in The Irish Theological Quarterly, July, 1913. Translator.)

[1] At the time of Eusebius the Province of Asia consisted of a narrow strip of land along the Ægean Sea. Duchesne. *La Question de la Pâque au Concile* de Nicée, in the *Revue des Questions historiques,* July, 1880, p. 39.

[2] The schismatic Blastus to whom Irenæus wrote (Eusebius v. 20, P.G., t. xx, col. 434) seems to be the Quartodeciman Jewish Blastus mentioned by Tertullian. *De Praescriptionibus,* C. LIII. P.L., t. ii., col. 91.

[3] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.,* V. 23-24, P.G., t. xx., col. 493-507.

yielded to the representations which had been made, we know that the Asiatic bishops abandoned their usage later.[1] If this fact shows that bishops have always the right to protest in a respectful manner against the wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff in matters of discipline which seem in their eyes to be too severe, it also shows that Pontifical authority which convokes bishops in Provincial Synods is fully aware "that it has the power not only to break off all relations with an ecclesiastical group, but also to place that group under the ban of the whole Church. By what title are we to address the Pope if we are not to style the guardian of such authority the Head of the Church?"[2]

Moreover, the mere initiative in everywhere summoning Provincial Synods, "an initiative which is effective, is sufficient to show how clearly the exceptional position of the ecumenical authority of the Roman Church was understood."[3]

Renan is not mistaken when he sees in this fact a proof that "the Papacy was already in existence and thoroughly so."[4]

68. Let us not exaggerate, however. The authority of the Roman Church "was felt rather

[1] This was before the year 276, for a letter of St. Anatolius witnesses to the fact that, the Asiatic Churches observed Easter at this date on the same day as the other Churches. Tillemont. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, t. iii., Saint Victor, p. 109-110. The Paschal question which engaged the attention of the Council of Nicea had to do with another point and concerned other countries, *viz.*, Syria and Mesopotamia. There was no longer question as to the celebration of Easter on the Sunday or the day of the 14th Nisan, but whether the Jewish computation should not be abandoned altogether (on account of its lunary year, the 14th Nisan fell sometimes before, sometimes after the equinox), and the more reasonable computation of Rome and Alexandria be followed instead. This computation, while it did not disturb the Jewish Nisan, considered as the Paschal moon that which immediately followed the equinox, and thus prevented the observance of two Paschs from one equinox to the other. Duchesne *art. cit;* Hefele, *Hist. des Conciles.* Leclerq. tl. p. 450 sq.

[2] Duchesne. *Eglises Séparées*, C. IV., p. 143.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Marc-Aurèle. C. XII., p. 201.

than defined: it was felt first of all by the Romans themselves, who, from the time of St. Clement, never had any hesitation as to their duty towards all Christendom; it was felt also by the rest of the world, so long as the expression of it did not conflict with some contrary idea, determined by circumstances" (*pré-occupation de circonstance*). In the exercise of her moral authority, an exercise which no one could have defined, the Roman Church was led sometimes to support men and sometimes to oppose them. As long as she did not cross them, there were no expressions sufficiently strong to express their enthusiasm and respect, and even the obedience they felt incumbent upon them. In the event of conflicting opinion.....men did not consider the prerogatives of the See of Peter so self-evident."[1] Thus it was that St. Cyprian, who, in his letters to Pope Cornelius, praised the See of Peter as "the Chief Church whence comes priestly unity," where the faith cannot be overtaken by error,[2] and who bitterly reproached Pope Stephen for not using his authority over the bishops of Gaul to depose the bishop of Arles and appoint another in his place,[3] made this remarkable declaration before the Council of Carthage at the very height of the dispute with Rome on the question of Baptism: "Every bishop in the fulness of his liberty and authority, possesses the right to think for himself; he is no more justified than is he qualified to pronounce judgment upon others."[4] "But in the ordinary course of events, the great Christian community of the Metropolis of

[1] Duchesne. *Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise.* C. XXVI., t. 1, p. 537. English translation, pp. 389-390.

[2] *Ep. xii. ad Cornelium.* n. 14, P.L., t. iii., col. 844-847.

[3] *Dirigantur in Provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litterae, quibus abstento Marciano, alius in locum ejus substituatur, et grex Christi, qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus et vulneratus contemnitur, colligatur. Ep. ad. Stephanum,* P.L., t. iii., col. 1028-1029. The testimonies of St. Cyprian to the unity of the Church founded on Peter are many. The mere index of these testimonies takes up more than a column in Migne's edition. *Pat. Latina.,* t. iii., col. 1328-1329.

[4] *VIIth Council of Carthage.* P.L., t. iii., col. 1092.

the world, founded at the very origin of the Church, consecrated by the presence and the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, kept its old place as the common centre of Christianity, and, if we may so express it, as the business centre of the Gospel..... Rome kept an eye on the doctrinal disputes which agitated other countries; it knew how to bring Origen[1] to book for the eccentricities of his exegesis, and how to recall the powerful Primate of Egypt to orthodoxy.[2] The situation was so clear that even the pagans were conscious of it. Between two candidates for the episcopal See of Antioch, the Emperor Aurelian[3] saw at once that the right one was he who was in communion with the Bishop of Rome."[4]

These passages which we have taken from the writings of Mgr. Duchesne, prove that he is not less assertive than Renan in regard to the existence of the Roman Primacy from the beginning. That he may be shown not to be self-contradictory let us hear the judgment he pronounces on Pontifical authority at the end of the fourth century. "It did not then possess a directive power, and efficacious expression of Christian unity. The Papacy, such as *the West came to see it later*, was yet to be. The position which it did not yet fill was given to it without hesitation by the State. Christianity became the religion of the Emperor, not only in the sense that it was the religion he professed, but in the other sense that it was the religion he directed. This is neither theory nor right, but it is the fact."[5] While the Papacy is as ancient as Peter, the exercise of its rights was not so clearly defined in the beginning as it was later. In the early Church which was

[1] Eusebius. *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 36, P.G., t. xx., col. 597; S. Jerome. *Ep.* lxxxiv., n. 10, P.L., t. xxii, col. 751.

[2] S. Athanasius. *Ep. sup. Decret.* Nic. n. 25-26, P. G., t. xxv., col 460 sq.

[3] Eusebius. *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 30., P. G., t. xx., col. 720.

[4] Duchesne. *Op. cit.*, pp. 537-538, Eng. trans., pp. 390-391.

[5] *Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise*, Vol. II., pp. 660-661.

more fervent, less numerous, and free from the interference of temporal authority, the centrifugal forces did not yet possess all the power they will possess when increasing numbers give greater opportunity for separatist movements which will frequently benefit by the assistance of the civil power. The need to allow to the successor of Peter those rights which appertained to him for the safeguarding of unity was not, in consequence, felt at first. In the fourth century, the Provincial assemblies of bishops under the protection of the Emperor will be practically a check upon Pontifical authority. The Arian controversy will be a more lengthy and more dangerous one, and "will bring regret that the organization of the Universal Church was not developed so far as that of local Churches. Unity will suffer."[1]

69. Undeveloped as this organization was, the Church of the first three centuries was endowed with sufficient vitality to protect herself against the manifold causes of dissolution that threatened her. Gnosticism completely disappeared during the third century, Marcionism, Montanism, and Novatianism offered more resistance, but this opposition was confined within narrow limits. The number of Christians who were separated from the Catholic Church, whose unity had been strengthened and whose organization was progressing in the midst of so many internal and external obstacles, was comparatively small at the beginning of the fourth century. This development of the Catholic hierarchy, and the organization of unity under such unfavourable conditions, seemed to Renan "the real miracle of Primitive Christianity."[2] He is right. The Spirit of Jesus worked the wonder,

[1] Duchesne. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I., Eng. trans., p. 391. For the evidence of early times in reference to the Primacy of the Pope, *cf.* the able article by P. Lebreton, S.J., *L'Eglise et la Papauté d'après M. Guignebert*, in the *Revue pratique d'apologétique.* Mai 15, 1908.

[2] *L'Eglise Chrétienne*, C. VI., p. 92.

but not His Spirit in the sense of the mere remembrance of His teachings. For a work of such a kind and such vitality there was needed the personal, energizing, and continual action of the Paraclete who had been promised. Jesus was with His own, even as He had promised He should be. Did He abide with them ?[1]

[1] We are strongly tempted to add to these pages which were written in the Summer of 1908, large extracts from the work of Mgr. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*. We prefer, however, to refer our readers who are anxious to study the questions we have touched on, to this excellent work itself; but we cannot refrain from quoting its concluding passages: "The rapidity with which Christianity was propagated during the first three centuries, despite imperial persecution, is not the only fact which surprises the historian: more astonishing still is the internal and organic development of Christendom. Far from being what Protestant historians would have us believe, it was a series of crises and transmutations which could only result in divergencies and dislocations. Christianity implies Catholicity, unity, homogeneity; such it was in A.D. 200 and A.D. 250, after two centuries of existence. The monarchical Episcopate has nothing in common with a successful *coup d'état*: the Roman Primacy nothing of a seizure by force; the unanimity of the Churches nothing of a painful and slowly concerted effort, knowing success and defeat. Neither the Roman Church nor any other Church played the chief part in this unifying work. The same must be said of the Roman Primacy which was acknowledged by all rather than claimed by Rome herself: it was even opposed in the third century after it had been proclaimed in the second. Yet Rome—and let us remember the Epistle of St. Clement—did not plead her own special right which she knew was divine; she exercised it. Catholicity, therefore, grew as a tree,—the comparison dates from St. Paul,—as a tree which developed according to its nature, and which had the continual assistance of the same God Who had planted it."

CHAPTER VIII.

The Church and the Churches.

70.—Catholic unity in the first centuries. 71.—Protestant disintegration. 72.—Union in "Liberty." 73.—The Self-Worship of Liberal Protestantism the logical outcome of Lutheran principles. 74.—The Anglican Church. 75.—Its divisions. 76.—The Eastern Churches: the increasing authority of the Byzantine Church led to schism. 77.—Decline of this Church: The Autocephalous Churches. 78.—Result of their union. 79.—Dogmatic differences. 80.—The Danger in the future. 81.—The Catholic Church.

70. "Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate" (Matt. xii. 25). Authoritative Christianity refuses to consider that the various warring groups which lay claim to the Gospel are within the One True Fold. Is Christianity then, by the very judgment of its Founder, destined to perish? Has it stood the tests of growth and of persecution so marvellously only to succumb, and, like every human institution, to disappear finally before the slow but irresistible action of evolution and time? Or, can we still find amidst the numerous religious sects which claim to be Christian, the Church of Jesus, of Peter and the Apostles, the Church of early days, grown indeed, but unchanged, ever the trusty guardian of the Faith, always truly Catholic,[1]

[1] Père de Poulpiquet, O.P., in his recent *Essai sur la notion de Catholicité*, which appeared in the Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, Jan. 1909, p. 17 sqq., shows clearly that we must distinguish between *Qualitative* Catholicity, essential to the constitution of the Church of Christ, and *Quantitative* Catholicity which is needed for the exterior manifestation of Essential Catholicity.

Qualitative Catholicity lies in the fact that, the religion preached by Jesus is a social religion, which, because of its beliefs and aspirations, uplifts man from the threefold particularism of individual reason,

that is, showing forth to the whole world a real, not a fictitious, union of minds and hearts in the profession of one and the same Faith, the use of the same worship, and the acknowledgment of one and the same religious authority? In a word, in the practice of one and the same religion which is not a national religion because it is the religion of the human race established by Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of all men? To this Church alone in its indivisible unity will the promises of life belong. The lessened, temporary life of other Churches will be commensurate with the individual graces conferred upon their members who are in good faith, and with the degree in which these Churches have preserved or imitated the faith and activity of the Church they have not wholly rejected and from whose influence they cannot wholly escape.

71. It is useless to seek amongst the numerous Protestant churches for the Church whose growth we have witnessed and whose unity of belief has been strengthened by the development of its hierarchy which is the safeguard of that unity. Those who started the movement of Protestantism did not in the first instance intend to destroy the Church. Their purpose was to reform and remake her, One and Apostolic, but without Peter, and independent of Rome. Their illusion was short-lived. None of the symbols which were hewn out of the Symbol of Catholicism by Luther, Melancthon, Zwinglius, Calvin and the rest, possessed unifying power. The history of their endeavour is an ever-living, actual demonstration, that a supernatural energy alone can unite Christians of every race and country in the profession of the Creed of the Catholic Church. They possessed and they still possess those natural forces which

philosophical speculation and ethnical or natural segregation. The Church of the Supper Room possessed this Catholicity as fully as the Church to-day, but that Church did not possess Quantitative Catholicity. This latter implies a certain geographical and numerical extension: it requires time for development, and may experience many fluctuations.

make for solidarity, and which are known as genius, civil authority, that intense need of religious association which is experienced by each soul, and which, perhaps, is most keenly felt by those whose hearts are sore because their need remains unsatisfied. If some of these forces are sufficient to give a temporary union of a fragile kind to a National Church, they cannot, even when they are all combined, make a living Catholic Church. The vain efforts of the Reformed Churches in France of late years to bring about a Synodal unity are particularly significant.

Orthodox Protestants insist that the pastors of their parishes, and assemblies (*consistories*),[1] shall unanimously confess, without equivocation, and in all sincerity, "the sovereign authority of the Holy Scripture in matters of faith, and the salvation of all men through belief in Jesus Christ, the Only Son of God, Who died for our sins and rose again for our justification."[2] They are of opinion, and rightly, that it is not possible that the faithful should be edified when they hear their pastors contradicting each other on such essential points. And while they permit the liberal thinkers amongst them to keep up a species of union that may be strengthened by acts of mutual courtesy, they refuse to regard them as members who are bound to them by any strict ecclesiastical communion.[3]

[1] They dare not demand that the ordinary faithful shall give their internal assent to the Declaration of Faith which is incorporated in the Statutes of the Associations of Worship. "It is well understood that this declaration, while it does not entail that formal adhesion on the part of the members of the Church which is exacted from the pastors, implies, nevertheless, that those members shall acknowledge that the belief proclaimed in the Declaration of Faith is the belief of the Church." *Ordre du jour adopté au Synode de Montpellier,* Juin, 11, 1906.

[2] Extract from the Declaration of Faith adopted in Paris, 1872.

[3] Cf. *Revue du Clergé Français,* Jan. 15; Fev. 1, 1908. *Les Eglises Réformées. Scissions récentes,* par J. Bricout.

The protest of the Bishop of Zanzibar against the "liberal" doctrines of his brother bishops of Uganda and Mombasa, which has given rise to the Kikuyu Controversy, may be cited as a case parallel with that of the Reformed Churches of France. Translator.

Liberal Protestants, however, will have nothing to say to the Creed of their orthodox brethren as a profession of obligatory belief, abridged though it be. They will accept it as a symbol, a sign of external cohesion, "an historical confession, evidence of the belief of our fathers"; but they insist, and not without reason, that Protestant liberty is incompatible with the obligation of internal assent to any Creed. They are anxious for union, nevertheless, and offer it to their orthodox brethren, but on the understanding that both pastors and people shall enjoy absolute independence in matters of religious belief, and that "the true Protestant device: The Gospel and Liberty," shall be inscribed over the portals of their churches.[1]

The demand of the Liberal Left for union with liberty has not yet been responded to by the Orthodox Right. A Centre Party has come into existence

[1] "The Delegates of the Liberal Reformed Churches assembled at Montpellier, November 21st and 23rd 1905..having regard to the liberty consecrated by the Synods of Anduze and Rheims with reference to the profession of faith, and convinced that their brethren who respect the legitimate scruples of the minority would never dream of imposing upon them a yoke that is intolerable to themselves, agree to accept as the actual Symbol of the Reformed Church of France, *without, however, acknowledging that it possesses any exclusive character*, the Declaration of Faith which was passed by a majority in the Synod of 1872." The following is the Declaration in which this liberal assembly made known its own opinions:

"Faithful to the spirit of faith and liberty in which our forefathers lived and for which they suffered:

"We assert that each member of the Church possesses the right and duty to seek his faith and his beliefs in the Sacred Scriptures and his own devotional experience:

"We are filled with joy at the thought that, in Jesus Christ we possess the supreme gift of God, the Saviour, Who, in His Person, by His teaching, holy life, atonement and victory over death, continually communicates to the children of the heavenly Father, the strength which is necessary to make justice and love prevail here on earth over all forms of evil, whether individual or collective:

"And to all who seek from God, in union with Jesus Christ, pardon of their sins, energy to lead a moral life, consolation in suffering and everlasting hope, we open our Churches in a brotherly spirit, and we shall ever see upon their portals the true Protestant device: The Gospel and Liberty."

Not to give a meaning to this intentionally vague Declaration which it does not possess, we would remind our readers that Liberal Protestantism does not admit the Inspiration of the Bible, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the Expiatory value of His death, or His Resurrection.

instead. At the Assembly of Jarnac in October, 1906, this party resolved to further "Union in faith and liberty independently of all parties." The Declaration of Jarnac[1] is a little more explicit than that of Montpellier in November, 1905, but when subscribed to by such liberals as Wilfred Monod, C. Wagner and Jean Reville, is not more compromising. It permits each pastor and each parish council (*association paroissiale*) to explain how "they make their own of the aims and principles laid down in the Declaration of Union."[2] Liberal in spirit, the French Protestant Centre-Party is only divided from the Left by the hope that, sooner or later it will bring over the Orthodox Right.

Meanwhile the three parties have thought it well to form three distinct Synodal organisations,[3] the Synod of "The Reformed Evangelical Churches" for the Orthodox; that of "The United Reformed Churches" for the Liberals, and the Synod of "The Reformed Churches" without any qualifying term, for the Jarnac Union. If to these we add the Lutheran and Methodist, the Free Evangelical and Baptist Churches, we have the chief divisions of the Protestant Churches of France.[4]

[1] The following are the chief passages of this Declaration which proclaims—"1. Belief in Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God, Supreme Gift of the Father to sinful, suffering humanity, the Saviour Who, by His holy life, His teaching, death on the Cross, Resurrection, and permanent action on souls and in the world, saves in the most perfect manner all who unite themselves with God through Him, and binds them to labour for the building of the City of Justice and Fraternity. 2. The unique religious value of the Bible, a document which contains the progressive revelation of God. 3. The right and duty that believers and churches possess of exercising free enquiry, in harmony with the rules of scientific method, and of labouring for the reconciliation of modern thought and the Gospel."

[2] Article 3rd of the Project of Union. Cf. *Revue du Clergé Francais,* Vol. LIII, pp. 159, 160, 161, 295, 296.

[3] The statistics of the "associations cultuelles" of French Calvinists given in the *Revue du Clergé Francais,* November 1, are as follows: Orthodox, 410. Liberals, 110. Centre Party (Jarnac), 75.

[4] Protestantism in Germany is no better off. In the Kingdom of Prussia alone, for each 1,000 inhabitants (exclusive of 41 Catholics and 38 Jews), there were in 1890, 40 Evangelicals, 37 Moravians, 33 Memmonites, 73 Baptists, 119 members of the Apostolic Church, 106 who

72. It cannot be denied that Protestantism is extremely anxious to preserve the principles of freedom, but what becomes of its unity? What becomes of the Gospel?

The union proposed by the logical Protestantism of the Liberal party has no other basis than a denial of Catholicism and of all obligatory revelation, and a feeling of the need to come into touch with that mysterious power upon which we all have the conviction that we depend. But then why limit this union to Christians only, since Christ was merely a religious personality stronger than others, but of whom we no longer possess historical data? The Jesus of Sabatier ought to join hands with his prophet-companions Sakya Muni, Zoroaster, Mahomet, etc. The Greeks who adored the forces of Nature in their mysterious and idolatrous rites, the most degraded negro fetish-worshippers invoking Him who is as unknowable as their hearts tell them He is needful, as well as pantheists like Spinoza and Hegel, may assemble in some "Liberal" Church with greater right than Orthodox Protestants, to give expression to that *religious emotion* which, despite the manifold tendencies of free, individual thought, humanity has nevertheless uniformly preserved.

Let us suppose that the adherents of the thousand and one forms of worship in which the religious instinct of humanity either is, or will be, made manifest, are assembled together; let M. Wagner address the gathering. He will not require to modify his Jarnac speech substantially to win the sympathy of his hearers, by urging men so utterly divided in religious matters, to a unity of belief such as he understands.

belonged to various British sects, 38 Dissenters, and 475 "Followers of Freedom," "Confessors of the Truth," "Thinkers," "Deists," "Freethinkers," "Humanists, Mystics," etc. M. Chenon *Les Cultes non-Catholiques*, in *L'Histoire Générale*, of Lavisse and Rambaud, Vol. XI. p. 549.

"In the spirit of Him who said: I am the Truth, there lies a marvellous power of reducing to a common factor the most diverse opinions. Where human calculations fail or lose their force, the Great Master of souls makes good his promise: There shall be one fold and one shepherd.

"I feel a generous current at this moment . . . . in the inmost depths of my being. I feel that the ashes of those who are gone are quickened into life once more. We who have assembled here, who have come from the East and the West, who represent the most opposite poles of human thought, are, nevertheless, as different minerals in a furnace, and we shall succeed in effecting a synthesis by the power of the fire that tests and mingles our substance. One metal shall flow from the crucible in which love and suffering have united us, the pure gold of (religious) communion."[1]

73. We may chant Luther's choral after this outburst, for if Luther is simply a Liberal Protestant, the Liberal Protestant is logically committed to the Lutheran idolatry of free examination. We say idolatry, nor is the expression too strong. What is idolatry essentially if it be not the perversion of the religious sentiment by man who desires to fashion his own God, to conceive of Him, picture Him, and mould Him according to his own measure and image, in order that he may have the satisfaction of adoring his own handiwork, that is, of adoring himself when he bows before the idol of his own making? And does not the religious free-thinker conceive of and fashion God according to his own ideas of what is fitting? God is not, indeed, the product of human hands; but

[1] The original text has "Christian communion." The logic of this sentimental outburst is not improved by the opening words of the passage we have quoted. "A travers l'héritage conquis au Golgotha et les liens qui nous rattachent à Calvin et à Luther, je sens en cet instant, etc." Yet this speech roused the greatest enthusiasm at Jarnac. Cf. *Revue du Clergé Français*, Vol. LIII, p. 294, for the whole text of the speech.

this nebulous deity is, nevertheless, a human work, complacent and changeable, the result of sentiment and imagination which revels in religious emotionalism, but which, on the pretext of "spiritual religion," denies that God possesses the power to establish an "authoritative religion," and which refuses to admit the supernatural or a mystery.

This form of idolatry, or to be more exact, of autolatry, is not less antagonistic to the Gospel than other forms. It was with authority that Jesus spoke, *quasi potestatem habens*,[1] of the heavenly Father; and His Apostles, St. Paul for example, when they preached the Resurrection and the truths guaranteed by it, would have been vastly surprised if their disciples had claimed the right to interpret in their own way the teaching given in the name of Christ. Men may inscribe "Liberty" on the doors of their Churches where the Divinity of Jesus and His Resurrection are denied, and where the Gospel is treated with more affection perhaps, though not with more respect, than the books of the Vedas, but they may not add "Gospel."

The Gospel is an orthodoxy, a revelation, which teaches transcendent truths concerning God to man in the name of God. These truths, while absolutely beyond the control of individual reason, demand, nevertheless, the assent of all men. Hence, unless there is some authority to safeguard it the Gospel could no more exist to-day than in the beginning. Orthodox Protestants are aware of this, and they refuse in consequence, to have "liberal" pastors in their Churches. The "liberals" protest, and with reason, that such exclusiveness savours of Catholicism. To possess the right of being orthodox: to put outside the pale of individual controversy every, even the least, point of revealed truth, necessitates the abandonment of those other rights, *viz.*, that of appeal to the principle of Private

[1] St. Mark i. 22; St. Matt. vii. 29; St. Luke iv. 32.

Judgment, and of revolt against traditional authority. These things which constitute the original sin of Protestantism, render the position of orthodox Protestants intolerable, and condemn them to fall sooner or later into the autolatry of "liberal" Protestantism.

74. The orthodoxy of Anglicanism, if, indeed, we may use the term with reference to the Anglican Church, is no exception. The Church of England "by law established" is certainly the least Protestant of the Reformed Churches. Henry VIII, on the pretext of absolute autonomy, caused a schism only amongst the English clergy when he ordered them to sign the separatist formula: "We do not find in Holy Scripture that the Roman Pontiff received greater authority and jurisdiction from God over this realm than any other foreign bishop." When the Church in England withdrew from the spiritual authority of Peter by which its Catholicity was assured to it, and the vitality that is promised to the Catholic Church, to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy instead, it became a National Church, bereft of any defence against political changes and the heresies which result from those changes. Ritualistic Anglicans of the High Church party are groaning under the servitude of the civil power, but the law is formal: "The King, our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be accepted and regarded as the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called Ecclesia Anglicana, and shall have and enjoy all the honours, dignities and privileges attached to this title."[1]

Henry VIII, only used this power to pillage and suppress the monasteries, and to overcome all

[1] Art. 1. *Statute of the Supreme Head.* 1534. The second Article says: "The King, our Sovereign Lord.....shall possess full power and authority to repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain and amend every error of whatever kind. And this for the glory of Almighty God, the increase of piety, and the preservation of the peace, unity and tranquillity of this realm." These Statutes, abolished under Mary Tudor, came into force again under Elizabeth in 1552.

opposition to the schism. He upheld the Catholic Faith in defence of which he had written an Apology against the Protestants. Immediately after his death, however, Cranmer, a dissimulating Lutheran whom Henry had made Archbishop of Canterbury, used the Royal Supremacy to have the principal errors and practices of Protestantism imposed upon the kingdom by the young king, Edward VI. The Catholic reaction under Mary Tudor was too brief, too violent, and too greatly suspected of being due to Spanish influence, to repair the havoc wrought in the preceding reign. Though Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn, did not go to such lengths as Edward VI, she caused the official Prayer Book of 1559, and the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563, to be so framed, that the Anglican Church must be regarded as one of the Protestant Reformed Churches from which, however, it differs in its preservation of the Episcopate.[1]

75. The Book of Common Prayer which was slightly modified in a Catholic sense in 1662, and the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563, are nominally the fundamental Statutes of the Anglican Church, but they do not make for unity by any means. The *High Church* party gives a forced Catholic interpretation to the Articles, repudiates the term "Protestant," and is only divided from the Roman Church on the questions of Papal Supremacy and the Validity of Anglican Orders. The *Low Church* clings to all that is Protestant in teaching and practice; while the *Broad Church* makes nothing of dogmatic or

[1] The only Rule of Faith is the Scriptures. The Three Symbols, of the Apostles, Nicea, and St. Athanasius (against which there is an outcry at present. Trans.), are allowed because their teachings are substantially scriptural. The doctrines of Purgatory, Indulgences, Invocation of the Saints, and the "worshipping.....of Images as of Reliques" are "fond things vainly invented." Two Sacraments only are recognized, Baptism and "The Supper of the Lord." "Transubstantiation" is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten....only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." "Sacrifices of Masses.....are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

ritualistic questions, and admits to the highest offices, clergymen who deny the Inspiration of the Bible the Trinity, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

The three parties are so mixed up in the administrative unity of the Anglican hierarchy that clergymen of the High, Low, or Broad Church, despite their contradictory teachings, are presented to livings and Episcopal Sees according to the good pleasure of the Government that is in office at the time.

When discussion becomes too strong, appeal is made to Privy Council which, as a rule, pronounces in favour of the broadest view as being more compatible with peace even though it is destructive of belief. These divisions, to which must be added the opposition from Non-conformists, Methodists and others who will have nothing to say to the Established Church, do not permit us to call the National Church of England a *Catholic* Church, or to believe that it can continue for any length of time to be the *Via Media* between Catholicism, towards which its sincerest adherents are tending, and that religious scepticism which is the logical outcome of Protestantism.[1]

[1] *Cf.* A. Gatard, "Anglicanisme" in the *Dict. de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. I., col. 1281 *sqq;* G. Planque, *Chez les Anglicans*, in the *Revue du Clergé Français,* March 1, 1908, p. 542 *sqq;* Thureau-Dangin *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIXe Siècle.* Vol. II, C. VIII, pp. 389-445. (*Non-Catholic Denominations*, by the late Monsignor Benson, 1910, gives a short but excellent sketch of the Anglican position. Translator). The Pan-Anglican Congress which brought to London in June, 1908, 7,000 Delegates both ecclesiastics and laymen, from the Colonies, America, and various missions established in non-English territory; and the Lambeth Conference in which 240 Anglican Bishops took part in the meetings, from July 6th, to August 5th, are proof of the vitality of Anglicanism, but they are proofs also of the need of union which is the torture of so many souls, and of the inability to find this union outside the Catholic Church.

There is no doubt that the earnest wishes expressed that the various Christian Churches might become united, were inspired by an ardent and sincere desire for unity, as is shown in the Letter issued by the Conference. Cf. *The Church Quarterly Review* (*The Lambeth Conference*), October, 1908, p. 16.

But how can the Anglican Church urge for unity amongst other Churches when she is unable to create it amongst her own members? We are grateful to the Lambeth Conference for having professed its belief in the Holy Trinity, and the great facts of the life, death, and resurrection of Our Lord which are taught in the *Credo;* but it did not, because it could not, demand such a profession of faith from all the bishops and

76. National also, and not more Catholic are the separated Eastern Churches. Unless they condemned the very principles of the Eastern Schism, the Patriarch of Constantinople and his Council in September, 1872, could not excommunicate the Bulgarians on the grounds of phyletism, of separatist Nationalism, because they had set up an autocephalous Church with the permission of the Phanar.[1]

It was on account of Imperial favour, the civil power and Hellenism that the Church of Byzantium, hitherto a suffragan Bishopric under Heraclea, became the "Great Church of Christ." It was as a "Court Bishop" that the Bishop of Constantinople obtained a decree in the Second Ecumenical Council by which he ranked immediately after Rome.[2]

This same Council forbade the bishops of Thrace to concern themselves with the Provinces of Pontus and Asia. The Metropolitan, however, did not consider himself bound by the Canon, and St. John Chrysostom ordered the deposition of certain Asiatic bishops. The Council of Chalcedon (451) put the seal upon this

clergy. Nor could it even touch on the grave questions of the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance upon which the clergy are so divided. The Conference insists that it desires unity but not uniformity: and it is precisely this uniformity which the Roman Catholic Church possesses. To safeguard the unity of belief in the supernatural truths revealed by Jesus Christ, an authority which is supernaturally guaranteed is necessary, to act as supreme arbiter in the discussions which the Gospel data will inevitably bring forth, and which no human authority can settle with certitude or in a manner which shall be accepted by everyone.

So long as the Anglican Church refuses to accept such authority will she be unable to prevent her children from drawing those conclusions to which the principle of Private Judgment drives them, or to realize any other union than that of "compromise" formulated by "liberal" Protestantism, and justly condemned by the Lambeth Conference itself.

May Christ's prayer for the Unity of His Church be heard. May it undo the evil which a long schism has caused, and lead our separated brethren to realize that, while many amongst them are disposed to acknowledge the Primacy of the Pope, Christian Unity, apart from Papal Supremacy is impossible.

[1] *Cf.* "Bulgarie" by R. P. S. Vailhé, A.A., in the *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, Vol. I, col. 1211.

[2] "The Bishop of Constantinople ought to take pre-eminence of honour after the Bishop of Rome since this city is New Rome." Canon III of the First Council of Constantinople, Hefele, *Hist. des Conciles*, Leclerq. Paris, 1908, Vol. II, p. 24.

usurpation, definitely placed the Provinces of Pontus and Asia under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, empowered it to act as Judge of Appeal in the ecclesiastical cases of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, confirmed its rank, and gave as the reason of its action the fact that Constantinople, like Ancient Rome, was a city where the "Basileus" and the Senate habitually resided. St. Leo the Great protested against the measure and its motives. "The procedure in spiritual matters is different from that in temporal affairs. Any edifice built upon a foundation other than the rock upon which the Lord built His Church will be unstable." [1] St. Leo was not deceived when he emphasized the dangers of schism which the pre-eminence of Constantinople, supported by the civil power, would create when that pre-eminence began to wane. His warnings were unheeded, but his forebodings were only too fully realized.

The supremacy of Constantinople in the East became greater when the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, weakened as they were by the struggles more ethnical than theological against the Monophysites, were almost destroyed by the Arabs.[2] Neither Bishops nor Emperor respected even those Provinces which at first had been under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome. The Armenian Basil in the ninth century wrote at the end of his list of Bishoprics of the Byzantine Patriarchate: "The following Metropolitans with their Suffragans, Thessalonica, Syracuse, Corinth, Reggio, Nicopolis, Athens, Patras and New Patras, have been separated from the See of Rome and are actually

[1] "Alia.....ratio est rerum saecularium, alia divinarum, nec praeter illam petram quam Dominus in fundamento posuit, stabilis erit ulla constructio." *S. Leonis Epistola ad Marcianum.* C. IV, P. L., Vol. LIV, col. 995. *Cf.* Epist. cv. cvi. cvii. The Papal Legates had protested already at the Council.

[2] Monophysitism and Nestorianism became the means by which the Syrians and Egyptians strengthened their national character against the supremacy of Imperial Hellenism.

subject to the throne of Constantinople. These Sees have been united with those of the Constantinopolitan group because the Pope of Ancient Rome is in the hands of barbarians."[1] The Iconoclast Emperors turned to their own advantage the schism caused by their heresy, and effected what Theodosius II. from 421, had attempted in vain. They dealt as they pleased with "barbarian" Popes, and withdrew Macedonia, Greece and Southern Italy from their influence. Some kind of Papal Primacy, however, was recognized, and those who suffered persecution, such as Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, sought the assistance of the Pope. But even at this date Photius, the rival of Ignatius, dared to pronounce sentence of deposition against the Pope, and summarized and popularized in his writings the wrongs which civilized Easterns had to suffer at the hands of the "barbarians" of the West. The helplessness, and sometimes the unworthiness of Popes during the periods of feudal anarchy, in the ninth century, destroyed whatever respect the people of Constantinople might still possess for the See of Peter. Was it possible that they should submit for long to those semi-pagans who knew no Greek, and whose uncouthness contrasted so unfavourably with the brilliant civilisation of the Byzantine Empire at this period? Michael Cerularius only expressed the contempt in which the Greek clergy held their Latin brethren when, in 1054 he published his pamphlets in which he stigmatized certain customs which obtained in the West as Jewish or pagan. At the time the Emperor was desirous for peace, and to obtain it he received the Roman Legates kindly, but Michael would have no dealings with them, pretending that they were not true representatives of the Pope, a fact which shows with what sentiments Papal authority was regarded at the time.

[1] *Cf.* The masterly Article: *L'Eglise de Constantinople*, by P. Vailhé, in the *Dict. de Théol. Catholique*, Vol. III, col. 1465-1467.

The Legates adopted the same tone, and in the Sentence of Excommunication which they laid on the Altar in Sancta Sophia they tactlessly censured usages and opinions which were not only those of Cerularius and his party, but which were those of the East generally. It was the surest way to make the idea of separation popular. A disturbance secured its acceptance in Constantinople despite the wishes of the Basileus, and the whole East was won over.

77. Thus proudly isolated, the Patriarch of Constantinople became the head of the Orthodox party in the East ; Bulgarians and Slaves recognized the authority of the Bishop of the Great City. But it was rationalism that withdrew the " Great Church of Christ " from the tutelage of Rome: it was the authority of the Basileus which assured its supremacy. Nationalism and Civil Autocracy are not the Rock upon which the unity of the Church can be established. The history of the " Great Church " is proof of the fact.

The Byzantine Empire began to decline from the hour of its separation from Rome. When it fell, the Church of Constantinople it is true, found an interested protector in the Sultan, Mahomet II, who confirmed its privileges; but even this act was not sufficient to guarantee its pre-eminence.

Orthodoxy numbers to-day as many separated Churches as there are nationalities. The Muscovite Church is now the " Great Church " because it is the Church of the Greek Empire. In the Russian Empire, side by side with the 70,000,000 faithful there are 20,000,000 dissenters of the old belief of Raskol.[1] It is not easy to give the number of the faithful in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. According to Greek statistics there are 938,000 in Asia Minor, and 2,834,000 in Turkey in Europe, but from this total we must deduct 2,000,000 Serbians, Roumanians and Bulgarians who

[1] R. P. R. Janin, A. A. *Les Groupements Chrétiens en Orient* in *Echos d'Orient*, Jan., 1907.

belong to the autocephalous Churches of which we shall have something to say presently. The Patriarchate of Antioch which recently separated from that of Constantinople by appointing an Arabian Patriarch, numbers some 230,000 Syrians. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem numbers but 50,000, and they are Arabs: but the higher clergy enrolled in the Confraternity of the Holy Sepulchre are drawn almost exclusively from the Greek Islands, and are in close touch with Constantinople, without, however, being subject to it. There are barely 50,000 faithful in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the native Egyptians being generally Monophysites.[1]

Each of these Churches is usually subject in the strictest manner to the national authority, or rather its interests and development are closely bound up with the ethnical group it represents.

[1] The Translator is indebted to the Rev. Father Reginald Walsh, O.P., for the following note:—

"The following data on the statistics of the so-called, or self-styled Orthodox Greek Church of Constantinople, the Russian Church, and the autonomous or independent Churches which have been formed by separation from the Greek, are taken from the best and most recent work on the subject, *viz.*, the *Kirchliches Handlexicon* (Herder, 1907).

About 4,000,000 persons are subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

About 8,000 to the Patriarch of Alexandria.

About 100,000 to the Patriarch of Antioch.

About 850,000 to the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

In Cyprus which, while Catholic, was declared exempt in 431, the Orthodox body now numbers about 183,000.

The Metropolitan of Athens or Head of the Church of Hellas, rules over about 1,922,000 in Greece: if Greek subjects resident in foreign countries be taken into account, he rules over a little more than 2,000,000.

The Patriarch of Karlowitz in Hungary (autonomous since 1848) has about 1,062,868 subjects.

The Bishop of Montenegro (autonomous since 1848) has about 220,000.

The Archbishop of Sinai (autonomous) has 60 in various parts of the world.

The Metropolitan of Hermannstadt in Hungary (separated from Karlowitz in 1864) has about 1,753,845.

The Exarch of Bulgaria (established in 1872), has about 2,842,650 Bulgarian Orthodox subjects. N. B.—In Bulgaria there are about 1,176,646 subjects of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Exarch is not recognized by the Patriarch; on the contrary, in 1872 the Patriarchal Synod declared the independent Bulgarians to be schismatics, and their attempt to set up an autonomous Church to be heretical.

The autonomous Church of Czernowitz in Bukowina (1873) consists of about 478,118 persons, besides 105,588 approximately in the Suffragan

78. What kind of unity can exist between such bodies? In 1902, the Patriarch Joachim III, in a Circular Letter addressed to the Heads of the other Churches asked: "Would it not be advisable for the Heads or the authorized representatives of the autocephalous Churches to meet at certain times and places to discuss matters of general interest to Orthodoxy?"[1] The Russian Holy Synod replied: "Desirable as it might be in the present circumstances, when the local Churches are so divided from each other by the boundaries of empires and the obstacles which the different governments place in the way of mutual intercourse, any re-union of Orthodox bishops, any public inquiry, and any solution of debated questions does not appear feasible. We can only wait and pray that this great project may be accomplished. The first problem to be considered by the Holy and Orthodox local Churches, is to strive as far as possible to realize the luminous ideal of ancient communion and unity by keeping in touch with each other by letters and other means, by continual intercourse, and the exchange of fraternal missives . . . and by the aid of mutual advice in difficult cases."

79. The luminous ideal of ancient unity, therefore, is only a dream for the Churches of the East. We have their own avowal of the fact, and their nationalism is to blame. Are the debated

Sees of Zara and Cattaro, and two small communities in Vienna and Trieste.

In the Roumanian Church (autonomous since 1865) there are about 5,500,000.

Bosnia and Herzegovina (since 1880 more or less independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople) contain about 673,861.

The Orthodox Russian Church which is subject to the Holy Synod in Moscow, consists nominally of about 87,123,604 persons, but included in this number are many dissenters. About a hundred years ago (1811) the Church of Georgia was absorbed into that of Russia.

[1] *Echos d'Orient.* Mai. 1904, p. 92.

[2] Extract of the Reply of the Russian Holy Synod published in its official organ *Tserkovniia Viédomosti,* June 14th. 1903. *Cf. La Question de l'Union et du Calendrier, dans l'Eglise Orthodoxe,* by R. P. Ratel, A. A., in *Echos d'Orient,* 1904, p. 92.

questions, a public inquiry into, and a solution of which, seem to be impossible, merely disciplinary or theological? We may judge for ourselves.

Is the Baptism of the Latin Church valid? Since the Council of Moscow (1667) the Russian Church has invariably answered in the affirmative. So also did the Greek Church at first (in the Synod of Constantinople, 1484), but later it denied the validity (in the Synod of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, in 1756). At the present time the Greek Church has referred the matter to the decision of a future General Council (Reply of Constantinople to the Athenian Synod, 1878). Meanwhile . . . the Baptism of the Latin Church is considered to be null or valid according as the baptized person consents or refuses to be re-baptized in becoming a member of the Orthodox Church.[1]

Does the Sacrament of Confirmation imprint a Character in such wise as to prevent the re-administration of the Sacrament? Certainly it does, replied Photius, who was justly indignant with the priests of the Latin Church for having re-confirmed the Bulgars. "Has any one ever heard of such stupidity as these men have been guilty of? They have anointed again with Chrism those who have been already confirmed, and by their act have profaned the divine and supernatural Christian mysteries."[2] If the priests of the Latin Church in the time of Photius re-confirmed the Bulgars, they did so because they believed—wrongly, it is true,—that they had not been validly confirmed previously. The Greeks and Russians go a step further to-day: They re-confirm their

[1] *L'Entrée des Catholiques dans l'Eglise Orthodoxe*, by R. P. L. Petit, A. A. in *Echos d'Orient*. Fev; Mars. 1889.

[2] *Epis. Encyclica*, P. G., t. cii., col. 725. Photius merely echoed the teaching of St. Cyril, St. John Chrysostom, Theodoret and the entire ancient tradition. Cf. *La Reconfirmation des Apostats dans l'Eglise Graeco-Russe*, by R. P. M. Jugie, A. A., in *Echos d'Orient*, Mars. 1906.

own subjects. The Character of the Sacrament is no longer regarded as ineffaceable. United as they are in their denial of the belief of the Church promulgated in Seven Councils, neither Greeks nor Russians are agreed when the consequences of this denial are in question. The Orthodox Russian holds that the Character of the Sacrament is destroyed by total apostacy from all Christian belief;[1] the Orthodox Greek believes that it is destroyed by the Papist heresy.[2]

When the sinner is forgiven is there any temporal punishment to be paid either here or hereafter? The Russian Archbishop of Kiev, Moghila, in a confession that is one of the Symbols of Orthodoxy, replies in the negative. Do prayers for the dead help those that are lost?[3] Dositheus, the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, in a Synodal Confession of Faith promulgated in 1672, and which still holds in the Greek Church, replied in the affirmative,[4] but

[1] "Confirmation is not administered a second time except to those who, having denied the Faith of Jesus Christ, desire to return to it." *Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία* of Peter Moghila, I Part, 105th reply.

[2] *Δοκίμιον ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ δικαίου* p. 407. This work which was published at Constantinople in 1896, is by M. Apostolos Christodoulou, Professor of Canon Law in the Theological School of Halki, the principal School of the Patriarchate. The abandonment of the ancient belief originated in an erroneous interpretation of the ceremonies of immersion and anointing which were prescribed by St. Methodius in the IXth Century for the reconciling of apostates. The meaning given to these ceremonies by the prayer of St. Methodius was lost sight of. He prayed that "the saving flame of Baptism which smoulders in the soul of the apostate may be spiritually rekindled, and that the sign which has been imprinted upon him may become more clearly evident." St. Methodius did not consider that the sign had been destroyed any more than he considered that the flame had been extinguished. Cf. *Echos Orient art. cit.*

[3] *Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία*, I Part, 66th reply, *sqq. Macaire, Théologie Orthodoxe traduite par un Russe*, is less clear and more hesitating. While he denies that sin must be expiated once it has been forgiven, he does not admit any deliverance from hell except in the case of those who have died suddenly, and of those who, having repented, have not been purified from their sins because they had not time to apply the merits of Christ to themselves.

[4] "With reference to those who have fallen into Mortal sin, but who, while yet alive, instead of giving way to despair have repented, though they failed to bring forth any fruits of repentance, tears, long prayers accompanied with genuflexions..to show their love of God and their neighbour by charitable deeds and the Catholic Church from the

changed his mind later, and in the new edition of the Confession published in Moldavia, wrote that: "It is mere trifling, not theology, to say that the punishment is not remitted when the sin is forgiven; the pains of Hell are for great sins, and from this punishment souls are freed by the prayers of the Church."[1] Unwilling to admit a Purgatory distinct from Hell as the Roman Church teaches, the Eastern Church began to waver concerning the ancient doctrine of the expiation of sin which had been forgiven: then to deny the doctrine as did Calvin, and at the same time to deny the immemorial belief in the definitive condemnation of the lost.

Are the deutro-Canonical books of the Old Testament inspired? According to the Second Canon of the Council of Trullum which the Eastern Church regards as Ecumenical, they are inspired. This is also the teaching of Moghila and Dositheus. At the present time their inspiration is denied by the theologians of the Russian Church, and the question is warmly debated amongst the Greeks. It is almost certain, however, that the opposition of those who hold to the teaching of the Seven Councils concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture is owing to the preponderating influence of Russian theologians.[2]

beginning has rightly termed such exercises 'satisfaction' we believe that such souls are lost, and that they suffer in proportion to the sins they have committed. These souls are conscious that one day they shall be set free, and that their deliverance is due to the bountiful mercy of God, through the prayers of the priests and the good works performed for them by their relatives..." Kimel. *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Orientalis*, pp. 463-464.

[1]Quoted by Renaudot in *Perpétuité de la Foi*, ed. Migne, tt. III., col. 1136. Dositheus appeals in support of his opinion to the apocryphal legends of Falconilla having been delivered by St. Thecla, of Trajan being set free by St. George, and of the liberation of the Iconoclast Emperor, Theophilus by the "Fathers," but he would find it difficult to name any Patristic authority. We have taken these passages from the Article by P. Jugie, *La Peine Temporelle due aux péchés, d'après les Théologiens Orthodoxes*, in *Echos d'Orient*, November, 1906, p. 321.

[2]*Cf. P. Jugie, Le Canon de l'Ancien Testament dans les Eglises Orientales*, in *Echos d'Orient*, Mai, Juillet, Septembre, Novembre 1907. These studies are now published under the title: *Histoire du Canon et de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise Grecque et l'Eglise Russe*. Paris, 1908.

80. There is urgent need of an Eighth Council to strengthen belief in the teachings of the other Seven, and bring about agreement on such important points of Faith amongst the different Eastern Churches. Yet the resistance shown by these Churches to the Calvinistic doctrine provided by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucaris, about 1630, must not be forgotten. The Eastern Church reveres Tradition which is a power against heresy, always a novelty. But while this power has been able to preserve in the East, intellectually dormant as it is under Mussulman oppression, the primitive faith in its principal articles of belief, though not, as we have seen, in all their perfection, it cannot hold its ground against the encroachments of the scientific free-thought of to-day. The education of the clergy is a means of defence, and after having neglected this duty for a long time the Eastern Church has at last awakened to the sense of its necessity. But in providing the clergy with lay professors who have graduated in German Protestant Universities, the Eastern Church is preparing the way by means of a sceptical clergy for the most lamentable delusions. When the evil day arrives, the support lent to the national Orthodox Churches by the civil power will no longer be sufficient protection, just as in Germany it is unable to protect Lutheranism. For the defence of supernatural truth a more intense union is required than that of protest against Rome on the part of the different rival Churches whose national jealousy will not permit any unity which necessitates guidance. Either Councils are required, or a Central authority which shall continue the work of the first Christian assemblies, shall decide dogmatic questions to which the onward march of the human intelligence gives rise, and shall safeguard the unchangeable Faith of the first ages by means of theological exposition, as careful of Tradition as it is generous in its acceptance of every rational truth which has really been demonstrated. To ensure this, however, a divine energy is

necessary, and such energy has been guaranteed to the Roman Catholic Church alone.

81. For what has been the progress of that "barbarian" Church which Photius and Michael Cerularius treated so ignominously? One-seventh of the people of the earth are Catholics, and unity of Faith and of government are not idle terms when applied to this Church.[1]

Its 220,000,000 faithful of every country, race, rite —even those of the East—are united in a society which is solidly hierarchical, which realizes the idea of a living body of which Christ is the Head, and is so carefully described by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 15-17): "Doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ. From whom the whole body, becoming compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity." We can easily recognize here that Catholic Church for which we have sought in vain amongst all other Christian associations.

We find "unity without uniformity" in this Society. Each people preserves its character and mental outlook; and, while the general arrangement of Catholic ritual and discipline is in perfect harmony with the character of these peoples, it is withal diversified by climatic and ethnological reasons, as the presentment of the theological conclusions of the Symbols of the Faith is more or less diversified at

[1] The statistics of the number of Catholics as published by Edouard Trogan in the *Correspondant, Chronique Mensuelle du Monde*, 25th January, 1908, p. 397, are as follows:—

	Inhabitants.	Catholics.
Europe	421,193,295	158,777,952
Asia	797,800,000	9,320,000
Africa	208,000,000	3,000,000
America	106,000,000	51,000,000
Oceanica	5,000,000	2,000,000
	1,537,993,295	224,197,952

different epochs by their mental outlook. But the control of the central authority, and, when necessary, of the great Conciliary re-unions, is a check which effectively prevents any individual or nation from breaking the vital bond that unites Catholic thought to-day with Catholic thought of the past, with that of the Apostles, in one and the same social belief, which is not dogmatic only but moral, and which is neither Semitic, Grecian, Latin, Saxon, Eastern nor Western, but is the humanly-divine thought of Humanity itself, quickened by the continual influx of the Word Incarnate and of His Spirit.

The Church has found it necessary to define many things, and frequently to interpret the definitions and directions of the first Seven Councils, in order to preserve the living, progressive work ever faithful to its origin. But she has never repudiated any of her teaching. In the face of danger from heresy or schism, a danger occasioned by the expansion of Catholicism itself, by the centralisation of states, and the facilities offered by the press for the propagation of heresy, the Church has ever believed that she too should benefit by the means afforded by steam, electricity and the press, to increase her cohesion, to enforce the organization of supreme power, and to give to the exercise of that power the full meaning of the words of Jesus to Peter: "*Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of heli shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*" (Matt. xvi. 18-19.) These words, and the authority given to them by Him who spoke, an authority which guarantees to them that grace which shall make them believed, are the whole strength of Papal power, a power that is solely the outcome of the conviction of the souls entrusted to it. We have called this power divine: must it not be so in truth, to create amongst its subjects throughout the world that

moral unity which makes the Church Catholic, a unity no human power has ever created or can achieve?

Yet the powers of hell have not failed to attack the Church. A Society of men in the process of sanctification but which is not by any means as yet confirmed in sanctity, the Church has had experience of the hardest trials foretold for her in the Scriptures. Perils from without and perils from within; the savagery and darkness of barbarism; the seductions of the renaissance; persecution and usurpation on the part of the civil authority; corruption amongst the clergy; the unworthiness or incapacity of certain Popes; the wholesale defection of nations which were led astray either by allurement, or because they were forced by the ambition or greed of their temporal or spiritual rulers who were without conscience:—the Church has been spared no trial except one—the teaching of heresy by the Pope in the name of Christ. There was a period when Providence permitted two Popes, and no one knew who was the true Pontiff, and the trial lasted for thirty years. This was a crisis so appalling that it should have utterly destroyed Catholic unity for ever; it showed instead, how divinely alive was the sentiment of unity in human hearts, and how its reality was divinely willed. To all appearance this was the time for inaugurating the regime of "sister churches," of autocephalous, ethnical, or national churches; Avignon on the one side of the Alps, Rome on the other. But Catholicity could not harbour the idea for an instant. All rivalries and rights had to bow before the demands of Catholic consciousness; the unity which had never ceased to exist in human hearts, became a fact once more, for the adherents of either Pope never admitted that it was lawful to divide the Church into two autocephalous Churches.[1]

[1] Gregorovius, the Protestant historian, says of this crisis: "A temporal kingdom would have succumbed, but so wonderful was the organization of the spiritual kingdom, so indestructible was the idea of the Papacy, that this schism, the gravest of all, only served to show forth its indivisibility." *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 3rd Ed., Vol. VI, p. 620.

How did the Church amidst so many pit-falls not only live but increase and prosper as none of her rivals have succeeded in doing? Does not her marvellous vitality testify to the reality of that special assistance of God which she claims for herself?

This vitality, we are told, however inexplicable it may seem, is not unique. It is not more miraculous than the enormous and lasting success of certain universalist religions, such as Buddhism and Mahomedanism. We shall examine this statement for ourselves.

CHAPTER IX.

The Church and Universalist Religions.

82.—Buddhism and its doctrine. 83.—Its growth and the reason for it. 84.—Islamism and its doctrine. 85.—Its success. 86.—Compared with that of Catholicism.

82. If we are to judge by statistics Buddhism and Islamism can compare with Catholicism, and claim a divine origin for their vitality, or rather furnish an argument to those who desire to explain the vitality of the Catholic Church by natural causes.[1] But any impression made by statistics disappears when we consider even casually, the religious facts they represent.

What is Buddhism? Its founder, Sakya-Muni,[2] the Buddha, *i.e.*, the Sage *par excellence*, who was born near Benares A.C. 557, was an Indian prince who, at the age of twenty-seven, left his home, wife and son, to bury himself in solitude. At the end of seven years he left his retirement to teach the wisdom he

[1] It is not easy to give even approximately, the number of non-Christians as census-taking is practically unknown amongst them. This is particularly true of Buddhism, while it is impossible to distinguish clearly between Buddhists, Shintoists, Confucianists, etc., in China. We give the totals of three Statistical Tables. The first is taken from the *Almanach Hachette*, 1902; the second, from the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, 1904; the third was compiled in 1907 by Dr. H. Zeller, Director of the Statistical Bureau at Stuttgart, Wurtemburg.

The First gives the number of Christians as 508,000,000; Buddhists, 126,000,000; Mussulmans, 212,000,000; Brahmins, 190,000,000; Jews, 7,000,000, etc.

The Second, Christians, 549,000,000, of whom Catholics, 264,000,000; Non-Catholics, 285,000,000; Mussulmans, 202,000,000; Buddhists, 120,000,000; Confucianists, 235,000,000; Taoists, 32,000,000; Shintoists, 17,000,000; Brahmins, 12,000,000; Idolaters, 144,000,000, (year 1904, No. 7, p. 203 *sq.*)

The Third, Christians, 534,940,000; Mahomedans, 175,290,000; Confucianists, 300,000,000; Brahmins, 214,000,000; Buddhists, 121,000,000; Jews, 10,860,000.

[2] He was called Siddartha, and belonged to the family of Gautama, and the royal line of Sakya, from which the name Sakya-Muni—the solitary of the race of Sakya—was appropriated by him. As regards the

had learned, and having taught for over forty years, he died of indigestion at the age of eighty.[1]

Primitive Buddhism appears to have been a moral philosophy derived from Brahminical speculation, which was to teach the sage how to find happiness without the help of any cult or prayer, by the sole effort of thought and will.[2]

Is there a Supreme, Eternal Being? The question is both idle and insoluble. What is of deeper interest to man is the inevitable law of immanent justice, the *Karma*, that reigns over the whirlpool in which all creatures are engulfed. The agitation of this whirlpool is the cause of all suffering. To free us from suffering by snatching us out of existence and bringing us to *Nirvana* is the purpose of Buddhist doctrine, with its fourfold fundamental teaching concerning suffering, its origin, its suppression, and the means that lead to its suppression.[3]

Desire for all that constitutes life is the cause of that agitation which oppresses us and of those painful contradictions which are inherent in such agitation.

name Buḍdha which means the Sage, or the Watchful One, it is the title he bears as Universal Teacher. It is not, however, peculiar to himself as there are many Buddhas. Abbè de Broglie. *Problèmes et Conclusions de L'Histoire des Religions.* Ch. vi., p. 166.

[1] "Sakya-Muni died of stomach trouble after he had eaten a dish of pork and rice which his followers had prepared for him. The Brahmins ridiculed such a death, and accused their adversary of gluttony. The Buddhists justify their founder, say that he was incapable of such weakness, and that the dish was a magical one which none, either god or man, was better able to digest than he. He ate it, they tell us, because his hour had come, and he wished to show how a sickness of this kind should be borne with patience... It seems that this prosaic ending was a fact, though it is not in keeping with the brilliant mythology of Buddha's life. We find it without any change in all his biographies." Abbé de Broglie. *op. cit., p.* 167. *Cf.* Oldenberg, *Le Boudha, Sa Vie, Sa Doctrine, et Sa Communauté.* Trad. Foucher. Ed. Vle, Paris, 1903, Part I, C.V., p. 196.

[2] We say "appears to have been," for we have no knowledge of the early life and teaching of Sakya-Muni except through a very confused literature in which the primitive teachings and later additions, whether doctrinal or legendary, must be kept distinct. The general conclusions we give, seem, however, to be admitted by all. *Cf.* Renouvier, *Philosophie Analytique de L'Histoire. Les Idées, Les Religions, Les Systèmes.* Paris, 1887. Vol. IV, C. II, t. ii, p. 122.

[3] "Behold, O Monks, the holy truth concerning suffering: Birth is suffering, old age is suffering, sickness is suffering, so is death. Union

To lessen this desire is to make for rebirth in a nobler life: wholly to extinguish it is to become certain of one's entry into *Nirvana*. And *Nirvana* means freedom from suffering. Does this mean annihilation? Is it the bliss of an existence which is immobile and unconceivable? Buddha has not told us.[1]

He who would be set free from suffering must prepare by uprightness of life for the contemplation of the teachings which Wisdom will give him![2] He should be indifferent to suffering

with what one loves not is suffering, separation from what we do love is suffering, in a word, frustrated desire is suffering, the five objects of attachment are suffering.

"Behold, O Monks, the holy truth concerning the origin of suffering: it is the thirst (of existence) which leads from rebirth to rebirth, accompanied by pleasure and desire which finds its pleasure now here, now there: the thirst of pleasure, the thirst of existence, the thirst of impermanence.

"Behold, O Monks, the holy truth touching the suppression of suffering: the extinction of this thirst by the complete annihilation of desire, in eradicating desire, in freeing oneself from it, in not allowing it any place in our life.

"Behold, O Monks, the holy truth in regard to the way which leads to the suppression of suffering: it is the sacred way with its eightfold branching paths, which are named: purity of faith, of will, of speech, of deeds, purity of means of existence, purity of application, of memory, of meditation." Extract from the first discourse of Buddha at Benares, quoted by Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[1] "The orthodox teaching of the early community expressly demanded that the faithful should not seek to know anything in regard to the existence or the non-existence of the perfect." M. Oldenberg supports this statement by several citations. We may be permitted to give the following testimony. When the Reverend Malounkyâpoutta visited the Master and expressed astonishment that his teaching left a whole series of important questions unanswered, *viz.*, Is the world eternal or is it circumscribed by time? Does the perfect Buddhist survive after death? Buddha replied: A man is struck by a poisoned arrow; his relatives and friends call in a skilled physician at once. What would happen if the wounded man said: I do not wish to have my wound dressed until I know who sped the arrow, to what family he belongs, whether he is tall, of short stature, or middle-sized, and what the weapon is like with which he wounded me? How would the thing end? The man would die from his wound.

Why did Buddha refrain from teaching his disciples whether the world was eternal or not? Whether the saint would or would not survive after death? Because the knowledge of these things does not make for progress in sanctity, because it does not help towards peace or enlightenment. Buddha has taught his followers those things only which make for enlightenment: the truth concerning suffering, its suppression, and the means of suppressing it. This is the reason, "Malounkyâpoutta, what has been revealed, is revealed." Extract from *Cûla-Mâlunyka-Ovada. Cf.* Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, Part 2, C. II, p. 274.

[2] The way of salvation—"is uprightness, contemplation, and wisdom. Quickened by uprightness, meditation is rich and makes progress:

and persecution,[1] but full of pity for the sufferings of all creatures,[2] ready to give himself to all, since the gift of self is a means of speedily escaping from what is perishable, a game which liberates one from the game of life.[3] He must preserve inviolable chastity, live on alms, possess nothing which could bind him to earth, practise austerity which is equally foreign to all excess and all pleasure-seeking,[4]

Quickened by contemplation, wisdom is rich and makes progress; when the soul is quickened by wisdom, she is completely freed from all attachments, from those of desires, of attainment, from attachment to error, to ignorance. As we wash one hand with the other, and one foot with the other, so is uprightness purified by wisdom, and wisdom by uprightness." Last instruction of Buddha. Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

[1] "I am the same towards those who vex and those who give me pleasure. Inclination and aversion are unknown to me. I remain impassive in joy and sorrow, when I am honoured and when honour is wanting : I remain always equable. Therein lies the perfection of my equality of soul. Caryâ-Pitaka, III, 15. *ap.* Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

[2] This benevolent, and sometimes beneficent pity is not Christian charity. "The charity of Buddhist ethics..is somewhat like Christian charity but does not ever attain its perfection, just as the bliss of *Nirvana*, so different radically from the Christian idea of happiness, resembles it in a certain degree. Buddhism does not urge its followers to love their enemies, it orders them not to hate them. It awakens and maintains a benevolent disposition towards the whole world, yet it is never unmindful that, to become attached to creatures is the sure way to come under the yoke of the joys, and consequently of the sorrows of this passing world." In support of this assertion, M. Oldenberg cites the following text: "All the sufferings and plaints, and all the sorrows of this world arise from what one holds dear: where nothing is so regarded, these emotions are absent. This is why those who are not attached to anything in this world, are so full of joy and so free from sorrow."

(*Le Bouda*, p. 289). Buddhism has never built hospitals, orphanages, or almshouses, it has merely brought religious mendicants into existence.

[3] "Buddha made jests to urge his followers to take leave of life without doing violence to themselves. Sanctity and charity became for them a diversion in order that they might turn from the joys of life."

Renouvier, *op. cit.*, p. 169. The means of salvation according to the *Lotus de la Bonne Loi* are: "Amuse not yourselves in that reunion of three worlds which is like to an encompassed house, amidst these shapes, sounds, perfumes, tastes, and wretched surroundings; for, when you are attached to these three worlds, you are consumed by the thirst which accompanies the five-fold quality of desire. Draw out of this reunion. These means of escape are offered you, namely the medium of the Cravakas, that of the Pratyékaboudas, and that of the Bodhisattvas (different classes of believers)....These means are excellent; they are lent by the Aryas, and provided with everything agreeable. You shall enjoy yourselves, amuse yourselves, and divert yourselves in your compassion for the wretched." Renouvier, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

[4] "There are two extremes from which he must keep who would live a spiritual life, what are they ? One is a life of pleasure, given up to pleasure and enjoyment: such a life is low, ignoble, opposed to the spirit, unworthy and vain. The other is a life of mortification, and it is

refrain from killing any living thing,[1] spend his time between the contemplation and preaching of wisdom, and seek solitude, without, however, depriving himself of the assistance which he may find in the example and exhortation of his brethren.[2] Idleness becomes a virtue in that the perfect must abstain from all work which could distract his contemplation: "When the monk has collected alms . . . let him betake himself into solitude."

The direct way of Nirvana is not compatible with ordinary life; but people of the world may assure themselves, if not of an immediate entry into Nirvana, at least of a rebirth in a better life by placing their trust in the holy triad of Buddha, the Law, and the Community.[3] The law is not a heavy burden for the laymen. Not to kill any living thing, not to steal, commit adultery, lie, or drink intoxicating liquors are the five prohibitions which are usually

sad, unworthy, vain. The Perfect keeps from these extremes and has discovered the middle way, the way which opens the eyes and the spirit, which leads to rest, knowledge, enlightenment, and *Nirvana*." *Discourse at Benares*, ap. Oldenberg, p. 127.

[1] "This is one of the four prohibitions made known to the monk on his ordination day. The ordained monk is forbidden: 1°. All carnal intercourse (même avec un bête—la bestialité pour les boudhistes du commun est peccadille); 2°. To take with thievish intent whatever is not given to him, even a blade of grass. 3°. To deprive any creature of life, knowingly, even a worm or an ant. 4°. To boast of possessing any superhuman perfection." Oldenberg, p. 344.

That there be deadly sin, however, which brings expulsion from the Community, the monk must have been guilty of carnal intercourse with some female creature of any kind; that the theft be a grave one; that the killing be homicide; and that powers and knowledge which are really superhuman be claimed by him.

(*Cf.* Kern. *Histoire du boudhisme dans l'Inde*, 2e. Vol. LIII, *Le Sangha*, pp. 87, 89, 93. Trad. Française.

[2] "Let the monk who has collected alms during a suitable time (from sunrise to noon), return alone and betake himself to solitude. Mindful of his salvation, let him not allow his thoughts to wander to outside things but concentrate them upon his soul. Or, if he holds converse with one of the faithful, or with another monk, let him discourse of the noble Doctrine, not of vain things. Many, indeed, are averse to all conversation, and we have no praise for people of such narrow views. From here, from there, something earthly clings to them, and they end by allowing their thoughts to wander far afield." Ap. Oldenberg, p. 356 (*Sutta Nipâta*, 388, *sq.*).

[3] "Alone, one lives as did Brahma (with the life which one receives from the Supreme God). Two together live as an (inferior) God. Three live as a village: when there are more there is noise and tumult." *Buddhist Proverb.* Oldenberg, p. 358.

found in Buddhist books; and they are directions rather than absolute commands. The chief duty, that of almsgiving to the monks, makes good many transgressions, and the layman need not be afraid that a scandalous life will deprive him of this means of salvation; he is never refused the privilege of almsgiving, or of enjoying the society of the monks, except in the case of an injury done to the community until satisfaction has been made.[1]

83. "Holiness of life, O Ananda, will not long be practised, the doctrine of truth will not last more than five hundred years."[2] Have these melancholy predictions of Sakya-Muni been disproved by the success of Buddhism? Yes and no. The numbers of disciples whom the teaching of Buddhism had withdrawn from a life of activity in the world went on increasing after his death, and more and more numerous also were the layfolk who put all their trust in the reverence they had for Buddha and his Law, and their generosity towards his Community. But after a period of really religious activity in India, Buddhism was almost entirely supplanted by Brahminism; but the Buddhist monks had already crossed the frontier and carried the name and cult

[1] "This interdiction was not decreed, as we may believe, in the case of scandalous conduct—for the community as such takes no account of such conduct—but only as a punishment for an injury done to the community. Eight cases are pointed out when this decision should be taken against a layman: When he tries to prevent the monks from receiving alms; when he attempts to injure them; when he seeks to hinder them from obtaining lodging; or causes dissension amongst them; speaks evil of the Buddha; of the Doctrine; or of the Community." *Cullavagga,* v. xx. 3. Oldenberg. p. 373, note 1.

[2] "Just as the blight comes upon a plenteous field of rice, O Ananda and then the rich crop does not last long—so also, O Ananda, when in any teaching (*doctrine*) or order, women are authorized to renounce the world and lead a wandering life, holiness of life will not prosper for any length of time. If in the teaching and the order which the Perfect has established, women had not been allowed to leave their homes and to lead a wandering life, holiness of life, O Ananda, would have been long preserved: pure teaching would have been maintained for a thousand years. But since, O Ananda, in the teaching and order established by the Perfect, women renounce the world and embrace the life of wanderers, holiness of life, O Ananda, will not be long preserved; the doctrine of truth will not be maintained for more than five hundred years." *Cullavagga,* X. 1. *ap. Oldenberg,* p. 163.

of their founder outside India, with the result that Buddha is invoked to-day in Indo-China, Ceylon, Thibet, and by a large number of Chinese and Japanese.

This success was not obtained except at the price of the radical corruption of Buddhist teaching. "The doctrine of truth" has not lasted even five hundred years: it barely survived Sakya-Muni. Having its origin in a keen sentiment of the sorrowful vanity of what is transient, it was an arrogant belief in metempsychosis, in the law of immanent justice, and in the possibility for the sage of procuring absolute deliverance by his own efforts; but it was not a religion. It was even a destructive agent of all religion, since it denied the efficacy of prayer and had no place for the thought of God in the preoccupations of its saints. This is the reason why our rationalists of the West find it so praiseworthy.

By an ironical revenge of the divinity who was ignored, the philosopher-monks of Sakya-Muni became a clergy. The statue of Buddha, who contemned both gods and prayers, was placed upon the altars as the representative of the divinity who hearkened to prayer, always in company with the local divinities transformed into superior or inferior Buddhas, and frequently as the prophet or the incarnation of that Supreme Being, the Adi-Buddha, who he was anxious would be forgotten. Not only did Buddhism become a religion, it was forced, alas! to accept every pagan corruption of the religious instinct, witchcraft and magic included.[1]

There are consequently as many kinds of Buddhism as there are countries and provinces; in Japan alone there are more than six.[2] Because Buddhism had no god of its own, it gave a warm welcome to all the divinities and superstitions of the

[1] Abbé de Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 183. *sqq*: Renouvier, *op. cit.*, b IV. C. V-VII. p. 172 *sqq;* de Milloué. *Bod-Youl ou Thibet*, in the *Annales du Musée Guimet.*, t. xii, C. VI, p. 172.

[2] De Milloué, *Aperçu sur les religions d'Extrême-Orient*, in the *Catalogue du Musée Guimet*, 1883, p. LXV. *sq.*

peoples amongst which it was established. The ideal austerity put before its monks did not hold for the lay people to whom polygamy, polyandry, fornication and every sin of the flesh, adultery alone excepted, was permitted, the latter being only forbidden in the restricted pagan sense.[1] This made for the suppression of the obstacles to the fascination which the too deeply rooted pessimism of the four chief truths of Buddhism exercised over minds in the Far East, its imaginative metaphysics, the passive kindness of its torpid pity, the poetry of its Indian legends, and the energetic teaching, both by word and example, of its monks, whose lives, in appearance certainly, were usually austere and often virtuous. At one with the dearest aspirations of the Oriental mind, compacting with its vices and idolatry, all that was required for the triumph of the community of Sakya-Muni's monks was their strength of association coupled with that state assistance which made them successful in Thibet, China, and Japan. This strength, however, was not enough to keep them in India, the only country where they lacked state assistance, where they were oppressed, and in which they had to encounter other monastical institutions which enjoyed similar means of influence. Can anyone really compare the success of Buddhism with that of the unyielding dogmatic and moral teaching of Catholicism and of its Crucified and jealous God?

84. The success of Islamism is not more striking and is less original, for the best of its ethical code must be attributed to those teachings which

[1] Throughout the Himalayas, polyandry is "practically general amongst the lower classes, small shopkeepers, artisans, agriculturists, and shepherds. It is, however, a family affair. Several brothers, sometimes five or six, espouse a wife who becomes the wife of them all, looks after the house, etc., while they keep it by their united labour." On the other hand, "polygamy exists amongst the nobles and the wealthy classes . . . Tibetan polygamy resembles that of the Chinese rather than that of the Mussulmans; that is, there is one lawful wife, the real mistress of the house, and a number (*ad libitum*) of other wives—a euphemism for concubines—the number being limited only by the revenue of the head of the house." L. de Milloué, *op. cit.*, C. II, p. 64-65.

Mahommed borrowed from the Old and the New Testaments. There is no necessity to sketch the life of Mahommed who had to confess that he was no thaumaturgus, since God had not bestowed such power upon him because the miracles wrought by former prophets had been useless.[1] His only authority was his visions of the Archangel, Gabriel, and from them, as occasion arose, the chapters of the Koran had their origin.[2] Mahommed could not read, and says he was illiterate (VII. 155-157). Hence it was in his conversations with Christians and Jews that he obtained those biblical references with which the Koran is so full. Judæo-Christian influence was seconded by Persian teaching which was sufficiently widespread in Arabia: and the elements of Islamism are taken from Jewish, Christian and Persian sources.

"There is but one God and Mahommed is his prophet," is the brief symbol of Mussulman belief. There is no Trinity. Jesus is Messiah, the greatest of all the prophets who have preceded Mahommed. His Mother Mary was ever a Virgin. Each of them is sinless,[3] and the prophet who acknowledged his

[1] "Nothing would have prevented us from sending thee as a worker of miracles, if the peoples of former times had not already treated those who preceded thee with disdain" (xvii. 61). Our citations from the Koran are taken from the translation by Kasimirski, and published in Migne's Collection—*Les livres sacrés des Religions*, t. 1.

[2] It was such a revelation, for example, which permitted the prophet to espouse Zaïnab, his adopted son's wife (xxxiii. 35-37), another which dispensed with the common law which limited the number of a believer's wives to four (xxxiii. 47-48), and a third which dispensed him from bestowing his caresses equally upon all his wives (xxxiii. 48-49).

[3] The Angels said to Mary: "God hath chosen thee, 'Whoso preserved thee from all stain, He hath chosen thee from amongst all women....God announces to thee His *Word*. He will be called the Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, honoured in this world and in the next, and one of God's counsellors....'Lord,' replied Mary, 'how shall I have a son?' 'It is thus,' replied the Angel, 'that God creates what He wills,' He says: 'Let it be, and it is' (iii. 37—42). 'We shall breathe our spirit upon her who has preserved her virginity, we shall make her and her Son a sign for all the world." (xxi. 91). Without counting chapters iii and xix. the latter being dedicated to Mary and the former to her family, there are many other passages in the Koran in which honour is paid to Jesus and His Mother, *Cf.* Ch. ii., iii., iv., v., xxxvi., xliii., lxi. Jesus was not killed; God brought Him up to Himself: it was only a man resembling Jesus whom the Jews crucified. (iv. 156).

sinfulness, also acknowledged his inferiority to Jesus on this head. The Gospel is an illuminating book (v. 50), but Christians by calling Jesus, the Son of God, have changed and corrupted His teaching. God could not have a Son, since there would be many Gods, a thing which is impossible, for God would no longer be absolute Lord.

To recognize the free and sovereign power of the One God, and to be resigned to His infallible Will, is the true religion, the real doctrine of Islam.[1] The Divine Will is predetermined with an absolutism which knows none of the distinctions of Catholic theology. It is the brutal predestination of Calvin: "We have created for Gehenna a multitude of djinns and men, who possess hearts that will not understand, eyes that will not see, and ears which will not hear" (vii. 177). Each one bears about him the unchangeable law which regulates beforehand his actions and his destiny. "We have hung each one's bird around his neck" (xvii. 14). It is quite true that other passages can be brought forward in which Mahommed contradicts this teaching, so frequently insisted upon, when, by saying that men are responsible he seems to presuppose free-will;[2] but it is not astonishing that the greater number of his disciples, obeying the temperamental instinct of the East, allow themselves to be governed by

[1] "It hath pleased me to give Islam to thee as a religion." (v. 5). "Islam is the religion of God" (iii. 17). The Arabic term *Islam* means "to abandon oneself at discretion," and is used to signify the surrender of a fortress after resistance. From the word *Islam* (resignation) the participle *Mouslim* (resigned) is derived, which in Persian is Mussulman. This religion of resignation is put forward as the true religion of Abraham: "Who is there who practises a more beautiful religion than he who is completely resigned to the Will of God, who does good, and follows the belief of Abraham the Orthodox? God accepted Abraham as His friend." (iv. 124).

[2] "The following is the most explicit of these passages: He hath takes the right road, takes it for his good; whoso goes astray, does so to the detriment of his soul.' (x. 108). A similar statement is found in Chapter xxvii. 94. Other texts merely proclaim the just punishment of evil and the just reward of good. Free-will, which is never explicitly affirmed, has never been upheld except by heretical Mussulman sects, specially by the great rationalistic sect of *Motazilites*, all powerful under the Abbassides but counting scarcely any followers at the present time."

fatalism, since the prophet himself makes appeal to it in the Koran. When the people of Medina complained because they had been led to the battle of Ohod in which they lost many of their people, were they not answered: "Even if you had stayed at home, those whose death had been decreed above, would have died all the same" (III. 148)? From such a conception of predestination there followed, of necessity, whatever Mahommed's ideas may have been, that practical fatalism which to-day weighs so heavily upon the sincerest of the Mussulman faithful.

Free or not, both the good and the wicked shall rise at the end of the world for judgment, to be sent according to their deserts either to a paradise of sensual delights, or to the hell-fire which Mahommed proclaimed. The unbeliever cannot possibly ever enter paradise, and it is impossible for the believer to be eternally excluded from it;[1] the prayer of the Mussulman who is lost will at last find intercessors who will obtain his release; the prayer of the unbeliever alone will be inefficacious.[2]

To be assured of God's mercy, escape hell and win Paradise, the five great Commandments must first and foremost be observed; these are the five pillars of Islam morality—1. The profession of faith. 2. Prayer. 3. Almsgiving. 4. The Fast of Rhamadan. 5. The pilgrimage to Mecca at least

[1] Such, at least, according to Mr. G. Sale, is the traditional teaching of Mussulman theology. (Edition Migne. *Les Livres sacrés de toutes les religions*, t. 1, p. 500. The Koran threatens with eternal fire the Mussulman who murders another Mussulman (iv. 95), while another verse of the Koran promises paradise to the Jews, Christians, and Sabians (ii. 59). But the promise contained in this one verse is nullified to a large extent by a number of other passages where the Koran threatens everlasting hell to all unbelievers no matter what their works may be. It is most probable that the verse in question dates from the time when Mahommed was still friendly towards Christians, and it was at this time that he also wrote: "Those most disposed to love the faithful are the people called Christians, this is because they possess priests and monks, men not given to any pride." (v. 85).

[2] The rejected will say to the guardians of Gehenna: "Pray to your Lord to soften our torments. But they will make answer: Have not messengers come to you bearing evident signs? Yes; they will reply. Invoke them, then. But the cry of unbelievers will be lost on the way." (xl. 52-53).

once in one's lifetime.[1] Compared with these five great Commandments, the moral exhortations, frequently insisted upon with real eloquence in the Koran, and the juridical and ritual precepts are of secondary importance. The Mussulman who murders his fellow Mussulman is threatened with eternal damnation. The wasting of the property of the orphan (iv. 2), and the most heinous kinds of incest are called grave crimes and great sins (iv. 27). But Allah is kind and merciful in regard to others, and will not be severe towards the repentant believer.[2] Not only is the believer allowed four legitimate wives, he may treat as he pleases the slaves he has taken in war or whom he has purchased.[3] He may divorce his wives and re-marry them at will,[4] and is urged to beat them if they are not sufficiently

[1] The Mussulman prays five times a day, and his prayer is accompanied with ablutions, either real or figurative, and minutely detailed ceremonial. It is usually made up of verses from the Koran. The following is the really beautiful invocation with which the Koran begins: "In the name of God, benign and merciful. Praise be to God, Lord of the Universe, the benign, the merciful, Lord of the Day of retribution. Thee we adore, and it is Thy help we implore. Direct us along the right way, the way of those upon whom Thou hast showered benefits, those who have never incurred Thy anger and have never gone astray. Amen." Almsgiving has become a regular legalized tax, but over and above this obligatory almsgiving there are others which are quite voluntary. This is one of the most faithfully observed rules of the Koran. The Fast of Rhamadan, the ninth month of the lunar year, may fall during various seasons of the Solar year. It is unlawful to eat, drink, or smoke except during the night. This fast which is very trying in summer, is naturally subject to dispensations. The pilgrimage to Mecca may be performed by a substitute; expenses are either wholly or partially defrayed. This commandment is not now observed so rigorously as in former times.

[2] But repentance must not be delayed. "Repentance is vain in him who continually commits evil, and, when death draws nigh, begins to exclaim: 'I repent.'" (iv. 22).

[3] "They preserve chastity who have intercourse only with their wives and their slaves." (lxx. 29, 30).

[4] "Divorce may be obtained twice" (ii. 229), on the grounds of discontent, and without the husband forfeiting his right to take back his divorced wife. But "if a husband divorce his wife three times, he may not take her back until she has been married and divorced by another" (ii. 230). This second husband is commonly known as *Mugarasch*. It sometimes happens that, when he has acceded to the request of a repentant husband and has married the divorced wife, he refuses to go further and divorce her that her former husband may re-marry her. *Cf.* Pere Jaussen. O. P. *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab,* pp. 347-348.

subservient.[1] Adultery is punished severely.[2] Sodomy is treated with more indulgence.[3] All friendships and religious controversy with unbelievers are strictly forbidden.[4] The supreme act is the Holy War undertaken for the defence and spread of Islamism. Paradise and forgiveness are assured to whosoever devotes his life and wealth to this work.[5] The Apostate is to be put to death without mercy.[6]

85. The Arabs, amongst whom Islamism was first preached, were not so savage as people believed. Their literary culture was greater than that shown by the style of the Koran.[7] They were idolaters, however, generally speaking, of an inferior social morality judging by the Code of Islam which reflects while it ameliorates it. The magnetism of his personal convictions, and the fascination of religious truth which was superior to the idolatrous traditions of his tribe furnished Mahommed with his first believers. The success of his first struggles, rather

[1] "You shall reprimand those wives from whose disobedience you have reason to fear: you shall keep them in separate beds, you shall beat them." (IV, 38).

[2] "You shall give a hundred lashes each to the adulterous man and woman" (xxiv. 2); but 'those who accuse a virtuous woman of adultery and are unable to bring forward four witnesses, shall receive eighty lashes.' (xxiv. 4).

[3] 'If two should be guilty of an infamous action, let them both be punished; but if they should repent and amend, leave them alone, for God loves to pardon and He is merciful.' (iv. 20).

[4] Controversy with Christians was at first permitted (xxix. 45); but the texts which revoke this permission are numerous. *cf.* vi. 67; ii. iii. iv., v., ix., xxii., xlviii., lx., lxvi.

[5] *Cf.* Ch. II, III, IV, VIII, IX, XXII, XLVII, XLIX, etc.

[6] The hypocrites who make profession of belief yet do not really believe are worse than unbelievers: if they openly "return to infidelity, let them be seized, and put to death wherever they may be found." (IV, 91.)

[7] Dosy, in his *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, is of opinion that the oldest Arabic writings, both in prose and poetry, are more artistic in style than the Koran. The language of the Koran, which was composed during the golden age of Arabic literature, is purer than the Arabic of the present day, but "it swarms with mongrel expressions borrowed from the Jewish, Syriac and Ethiopian languages....

The Koran contains more than one grammatical error, and it was Arabian grammarians who perpetrated these mistakes and sought to justify them by rules or by exceptions to rules." (pp. 119-120.)

than a sincere belief, was the determining cause of the wholesale conversion of the Arabian nomads. Mahommed boasted of this and wrote in the Koran: "The Bedouins say: We have believed. Make answer to them. By no means. Say rather: We have embraced Islam, for the faith has not as yet sunk into your hearts." (xlix. 14.)[1] In order to win them to the new religion, the prophet and his successors had the brilliant idea of proposing a monster razzia, and of hurling them upon the neighbouring kingdoms under the pretext of a Holy War. The time could not have been more favourable. The Byzantine and Persian empires had only emerged from a long and terrific struggle, weakened in resources and men.[2]

The natives of Syria and Egypt, persecuted on account of the Monophysite heresy of their national

[1] "With the exception of the small number of Mussulman emigrants, the inhabitants of Medina and a few persons who joined them, there were not many who knew the Koran and what it prescribes. The Arabs who settled in Africa were not aware a century later that Mahommed had forbidden wine....After the victory of Kadisia over the Persians (635) he discovered that even when each one had received his share of the plunder much still remained. Omar wrote to have it distributed amongst those who knew by heart the longest passages of the Koran. The general summoned those who had been chiefly instrumental for the victory, and asked Amribn-Madi-Karib what he knew. "Nothing," he replied: "I embraced Islamism in the Yemen, and have had too much to do with fighting to be able to study the Koran." "And you," said the General to Bichr de Taif? "Oh! I know much more than Amr: *In the name of the merciful God.*"—It was all he knew." (Dosy. *op. cit.*, p. 71.) Even to-day the Bedouins are the least fervent of the Mussulmans.

[2] This struggle had lasted for a century, and had only ended in 628, barely six years before the Arab incursion. Revolution had succeeded in undermining conquered Persia. "In four years, nine kings sat on the throne left vacant by the murder of Khosroés II. There was neither government nor army: the satraps, merzahbans, the ispaheds in the provinces, and the lords or dighāns in their fortress-castles, became independent potentates; the empire fell to pieces.....

Order is more apparent in the Byzantine Empire after Heraclius, but the drain is as great....New taxation was imposed, and the demands of the imperial treasury became more oppressively insistent. The army which had lost 200,000 men in the Persian war was not recruited, the commanders on the frontiers and chief councillors received no salary. The Patriarch Sergius who had inspired many strong resolutions, now started religious disputes. It only remained to create a new sect, the Monothelites, who joined hands with the Nestorians, Monophysites, and Jacobites. These dissenters are filled with hatred against a government which persecuted them in the name of orthodoxy; their hostility becomes more and more dangerous." M. Wahl. *Mohammed et l'Islamisme*, in the *Histoire Générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud, C. IX, t. I, pp. 463-464.

clergy, and crushed by taxation, gladly agreed to obey the Semites, their brethren in race and language, in order to escape from the hateful Grecian yoke. Their new position belied their dreams. Christianity was tolerated, but the Christians were treated as pariahs. To escape from such a state of humiliation and degradation numbers of people, whose only convictions are those engendered by a religion which is all-powerful, became Mussulmans under the caliphs, just as people became Christians under the emperors. This was all the easier for lax and ignorant Christians, in that Islam presented its doctrine in the name of Jesus and Mary as well as in that of Mahommed. The religious and civil anarchy which devastated Persia made the triumph of Mahomedanism still more assured; and when the Mongolian armies appeared on the scene five centuries later, their leaders hesitated for a time between Buddhism, Christianity and Islamism. Islam, since it possessed more of the truth than Buddhism, was the religion of the great majority of the conquered races over which they were to rule. The Pope was far away, and his envoys, sent at rare intervals, were completely ignorant of Mongolian customs and language. The Greek missionaries were insufficient, the Western Crusaders were beaten; and when Tagoudar Ogoul, who had been baptized at first, declared on ascending the throne in 1282, that he was a Mussulman, Central Asia was definitely won to Mahomedanism.

The Mongolian army carried it into the Western provinces of China and the northern parts of India; while Persian merchants brought it to the coasts of the Sunda Islands. It still makes some progress amongst idolatrous peoples, and the half-pacific, half-warlike propaganda of the chiefs of the slave tribes of the north of Africa, spreads it amongst the fetish worshippers of Central Africa.[1]

[1] *Cf.* Dosy, *op. cit.*, C. VI, XII, XIV.

86. Can we infer from the success of Islamism that Catholicism also is merely the result of an evolution which is purely natural? Certainly not: for the evolution of Catholicism is astonishing in a very different manner. Its Founder was crucified: the prophet of Islam became a mighty and formidable prince before he died—thanks to the rivalry between Medina and Mecca—a rivalry which he used to make his religion a kingdom of this world. Instead of twelve Galileans there were thousands of Bedouins who gave themselves up to pillage while they sought to make a conquest of souls. It is true that powerful political influences helped the spread of Catholicism, but only after it had expanded in a marvellous manner during three centuries of persecution. Mahomedanism became an imperial power before it could exercise a peaceful apostolate. Yet the sword is not its only means of success, though the sovereignty of Mahomedan states is still the great motive of credibility which gives authority to its teachers.

"The wonderful simplicity of the constituent elements of the Mussulman religion helped its expansion from the beginning, and still assures its progress. Each one can introduce his own ideas, convictions and hopes into this vast, flexible and mobile framework without injuring it or doing violence to their ideas, provided they do not savour either of atheism or idolatry. The 175,000,000 Mussulmans are divided by very diverse conceptions of this world and the next. There are no less than seventy-three sects, of which four are orthodox.[1]

[1] The number of 73 sects is given by Mussulman theologians themselves, after an expression, "hadits," attributed to Mahomet since the third century of the Hegira. The number 73 is taken as a sign of perfection in comparison with Christianity which will have only 72, and Judaism which will have 71 only. Dosy. *op. cit.*, p. 196.

This peculiar tradition does not furnish us with the exact number of Mussulman sects, though it shows that many must have sprung up, and speedily, since it was necessary to make appeal to a statement of the prophet to justify the dissensions. The two great Mussulman sects, the Shiites, Persian heretics who reject tradition, and the Sunnites, or orthodox Mussulmans, must not be overlooked. The former claim Mahomed through his son-in-law, Ali and his descendants: the latter recognize as the

If we except the Fast of Rhamadan, which is mitigated, largely by feasts prolonged through the entire night, and the ambition innate in each Mussulman to win as a title to nobility the name of "hadji" or pilgrim, by going at least once in his lifetime to Mecca, we can easily understand that Islamism does not weigh too heavily either on the consciences or the lives of its followers. It knows how to adapt itself when necessity arises, and to change according to its needs." [1]

Strong in the rational truths it teaches concerning God and final retribution, unencumbered by the mysteries of Catholic belief, adorned with legends proportionate to the imagination of simple folk, preaching a morality which has its value, and which makes allowances for the passions, Mahomedanism, while it is incapable of appealing to cultured minds, and was forced to forbid all philosophical study in order to safeguard its orthodoxy,[2] possessed, and still retains, humanly speaking, every chance of obtaining followers amongst those less cultured peoples of whom European civilisation makes sceptics, not converts—the Turks, Arabs, and Persians.[3] But it is quite different with Catholicism.

prophets Vicars, not only Ali and his descendants, but the Khalif successors of Mahomet. Shiites and Sunnites regard each other as infidels.

[1] M. Hartwig Derenbourg, *La Science des religions et l'Islamisme* in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, t. XIII, n. 3. Mai-Juin, 1886, pp. 323-327.

[2] This prohibition began in the East in the reign of the Sultan Al Motawakil, about 860, and became definite with the condemnation of Averroes, his writings and disciples in Spain in the reign of the Caliph Jacoub Almanzor, at the close of the twelfth century. Dosy, *op. cit.*, C. VIII, XI.

[3] "Islam has no apostates," says P. Palmieri in concluding his lengthy and excellent article on the Koran, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, t. II, col. 1844. If by apostates is meant those who no longer believe in God or Mahomet, Islam is no better off than other religions. Nor is it correct to say that no Mussulmans become converts to Christianity. We have known those who did: and the White Fathers of Algiers have whole villages in Kabylia, inhabited by fervent Mussulman converts.

But it is true that, generally speaking, conversions are few. Still, it should be remembered that Catholic missionaries in Turkey do not attempt to preach to the Mussulmans, not only on account of the danger to the converts but also because of the difficulties which such an apostolate

With its mysteries which are disconcerting to reason, its moral law which challenges the passions, its ideal of charity and self-denial which crucifies selfishness, Catholicism takes its stand as the pitiless foe of pride of spirit and fleshly desire. The anger and hatred which its discipline has occasioned and which at times burst forth in cruel persecution of deplorable apostacy, have not made it blot out a line of its creeds, or yield up even one of its moral laws. Nay, men reproach it with having added to them. Speaking in the name of God, and trusting in the signs of its divine Mission, Catholicism demands the homage of the thinker and the scholar, just as it uplifts the mind and heart of the savage. If it forbids the ordinary faithful to have dealings with sophists, it defends the rights of reason against those who deny them. It is the wish of the Catholic Church that wise men should philosophize, while respecting those dogmas which she makes known throughout the world. The warfare waged against her at the present time by materialistic unbelief shows very clearly nature's antagonism to the laws of the Church. If Catholicism is not divine, it must succumb in a short time; but such antagonism is old —as old as Catholicism. It has robbed many souls from the Church, and will rob more, yet it cannot prevent her expansion and cannot cause her death. If she could die, she would have died long ago, and in any case, she would not be any longer that religious society, which, for numbers, and for the dogmatic and moral training of her subjects, bids defiance to all

would entail upon the Missions and their Christian communities. In the French colonies, the hostility, and not infrequently, the impiety of the heads of the administration, are obstacles, to all apostolic work. In Russia, the Tartars are Mussulmans because they wish to remain Tartars. In fact Islam possesses this peculiarity, that its religious code is at the same time a domestic and civil code: once he has become associated with, and has adopted the morality of a people or nation, the Mussulman, though he may not believe in his own religion, cannot profess another without breaking away from his race and people. His antipathy to all religious controversy, his pride in his monotheistic faith, the weakening of all moral force—the consequence of his fatalism, and sensual life—do not prepare him for a conversion which demands sacrifice.

comparison with any sect, whether of heretics or infidels.

But, if the life of the Catholic Church is divine, how does it come that she is not more widespread? How is it, that after twenty centuries of preaching and of grace, the world still remains unconquered? We shall now attempt to reply to this question.

CHAPTER X.

The Church and the World.

87.—Objection: Why are there so many non-Catholics? 88.—"Outside the Church there is no salvation." The meaning of this expression. 89.—The elements of Catholic belief. 90.—To be found amongst non-Catholics. 91.—To what the facilities for salvation are compared. 92.—The Sin against the Holy Ghost. 93.—Answer to the objection: Degrees of the supernatural life. 94.—The Church "the salt of the earth."

87. Two hundred and twenty-four million Catholics is a large number, but it is not large enough to prevent anxious-minded believers asking: How does it come that a God of love such as the Gospel reveals, who has given His Son to the world, has permitted that evil-doers of every kind, heretics and schismatics, should still be in the majority after an apostolate of twenty centuries? Without any violence to human liberty, God could make the whole world Catholic as easily as He has given and preserved to the Church these two hundred and twenty-four millions. The marvellous power of grace is as much a truth of faith as God's infinite love. Yet how can we reconcile these two truths with the fact that the human race seems to be a mass of perdition? Let no one reproach us for having put the case too strongly. It presents itself in this way to every one who has any little experience. And if the question can be kept from those who live in a Catholic atmosphere:—a Convent, a Catholic school, or a village where religious traditions are still faithfully observed which makes for the moral well-being of those who live in it, it forces itself upon the student of history, upon those

who have to face the world, upon the soldier, the sailor, the traveller, upon the scholar who studies the records of those who lived before Christ, and upon the missioner who vainly calls down the all-powerful grace of an all good God upon the unbelievers whom his zeal and preaching cannot move. The question is raised, developed and also exaggerated by teachers in our primary schools, and in the manuals of the history of Religions that are placed in the hands of youth. For want of a satisfactory explanation, alas! the question breeds scepticism, or such an idea of God's mercy as to make His justice no longer feared. When it seems impossible for an infinitely powerful, and infinitely good God to abandon the immense majority of men to everlasting fires, if the sinner who is a Catholic does not go so far as to doubt the teachings of his faith he very easily persuades himself that he is sheltered from the rigours of divine justice. What has he to fear? Other men are greater sinners than he! That he, a Catholic, who still attends Mass on great feasts, who does not steal, who stands up for the right, that he should lose his soul! Impossible! If this were true, God in justice should condemn nine-tenths of the human race. But God is not only just. He is good and merciful; and He has not created men merely for the sake of seeing them burn. Hell! a scarecrow! for does not God make dire menaces just to make His punishments less severe? How many others are there who, in their anxiety to excuse the frivolous and foolish come at length to say: To condemn the whole world! This may have satisfied the credulity of people in the Middle Ages; we do not believe it. If there is a God, He is better than His priests make Him appear; and the religion that makes God the executioner of the human race cannot be the true religion of that God who calls Himself—Love!

But God is Charity. In our exposition of the mysteries of Catholic Dogma we hope to show how God is good even in regard to the lost. But we feel called upon to state now, that the comparatively

restricted development of Catholicism is no evidence that God is not merciful towards all men, or that He does not give sufficient means of salvation to all; while it does not permit any sinner, even a Catholic, to shelter himself from the chastisement apportioned to every mortal sin which contrition has not washed away.

88. *Outside the Church there is no Salvation.* All theologians are agreed that the explicit profession of the full Catholic faith is necessary with the necessity of a precept, that it is binding upon all who are, or ought to be, sufficiently acquainted with the truth of that faith, but that it is not necessary with the necessity of a means.[1] Every one, who, in good faith[2] is ignorant of the obligation of embracing Catholicism, may, nevertheless, belong to the soul of the Church if in his heart he possess that Catholic belief without which no one can be saved. Yet does it not seem a misuse of language to speak of a man being a Catholic at heart who not only does not belong to the Church but who may be even opposed to the Church ? And how can we imagine that God Who has established the Church does not give sufficient light to enable all men to recognize it ? These seeming antinomies will disappear, we hope, when we consider what Catholic faith, supernatural life, and their degrees really are.

Catholic faith is that which everywhere and always, has been and shall be, the necessary principle of supernatural life. Whether there is question of Adam or of the faithful in the last days ; of the lowest savage or the greatest thinker; of the child

[1] *Cf.* Hugon, O. P. *Hors de l'Eglise point de Salut.* Paris, 1907.

[2] All they are in "good faith" who, through no fault of theirs but in consequence of family traditions, educational prejudice, or environment, have no doubts regarding their faith which they profess with entire sincerity. They do not begin to be in bad faith, and, consequently to incur the responsibility of their errors, until the time comes, when, rebelling against the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, Who calls them to the knowledge of the full truth, they refuse to discuss their doubts sincerely, either through pride, or on account of the temporal disadvantages attendant upon their conversion, or through negligence or carelessness in reference to religious truth to which they are indifferent.

whose reason has begun to awaken, or the deepest theologian, this Catholic faith is always and everywhere essentially the same because it *is* Catholic: while in its explicit development it is as varied as the conditions, faculties, vocation and supernatural gifts of the believer whose mind and heart it subjects to God's influence are varied.

Supernatural in its object, which is for all men the existence, life, and merciful goodness of a just God Who redeems and rewards, supernatural in its principle, which is the grace of this same God, indissolubly united to the pre-required activity of a revelation that unfolds to the intelligence, either interiorly or exteriorly, an idea of God such as reason alone could never give, Catholic faith is not a vague religious impression bereft of any conscious idea of a divine personality. It may, however, be reduced to the simple notion of a free and intelligent sovereign authority, just, yet paternal, to the human being in whom it takes an interest, and whom it calls to salvation before it pronounces judgment.[1]

Under the influence of this first revelation of the divine, the believer is prepared to accept mysteries. If he has no exact idea of the Infinite Being to Whom he entrusts himself, he at least possesses the true sentiment regarding this Being. With his whole soul he seeks and desires further revelations which shall render explicit those mysteries that are known implicitly in that first notion of a God Who governs and saves men as He pleases: *secundum modos sibi placitos*. Hence he is as fully disposed as is the best instructed Catholic to welcome all those supernatural teachings whose divine origin it will be possible for him to recognise. In desire, and frequently without appearing to be so, he is child of that Church to which have been entrusted the truths he seeks,—the Catholic Church. St. Thomas draws attention to this perfection of the most elementary belief when he says that:

[1] He that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him (Heb. xi. 6).

"All the articles of faith are implicitly contained in the first propositions of the Creed as in that by which we believe that God exists, and that His Providence is concerned with the salvation of men." [1]

Yet because of its very simplicity and independence of the elaborated and precise conclusions of metaphysics, belief which implicitly contains the entire Catholic faith, may co-exist with certain errors in regard to the attributes of God whose contradiction with his faith the believer does not perceive, and which no competent authority has pointed out to him.[2]

Thus we find that some monks of the desert did not exclude all corporeity from God; [3] while not a few ill instructed Catholics scarcely distinguish the true God Whom they adore, from the images by which they try to picture Him to themselves.[4]

This simple faith in One who is Sovereign and Just, who is Supreme Giver of life and happiness, and Guardian of the moral law, is sufficient since the promulgation of the Gospel,[5] as it was sufficient

[1] *Summ. Theol.* IIa, IIæ, Q, I, a. 1.

[2] Suarez. *De Fide*, disp. xii. sect. iii. n. 3; Card. Mazzella, *De Fide*. dis. iii. art. 12, n. 872.

[3] Cassian *Collationes Patrum*. Coll. X. col. 11-V. P.L. F. xlix. 820—826.

[4] "The rational idea on the contrary, which can be given us by a sane philosophy, is more precise, more exclusive of metaphysical error; but on the other hand it is more circumscribed, does not lend itself to an indefinite progression, and when it has reached the maximum of explicitness, runs the risk of becoming retrograde. The reason is that, while it allows us to divine the mystery, it does not in any way adapt itself to it. To the satisfaction it afforded us at first is soon added vexation at being unable to solve the mystery; and, despairing of conceiving of the infinite it labours to lower it to its own level. Hence arose all the errors of purely philosophical theodicies." We have taken this passage from our article *L'Eveil du sens moral*, in the *Revue Thomiste*, Janvier, 1906, pp. 655 sqq., in which we attempt to determine the difference that obtains between the natural and rational idea of God, and the parallel yet revealed idea of it which is furnished by elementary faith. A full exposition of the theory of the faith of non-Christians, a résumé of which we give here, will be found in the above mentioned article.

[5] This is the opinion of the theologians of Salamanca, *De Fide*, Disp. vi., dub. 1, n. 77, and is becoming more generally accepted at the present time. But explicit belief in the Holy Trinity is required in those who would enter the body of the Church, in which, in all that regards the Trinity and the Incarnation there cannot be any question between *minores et majores* (ii, ii, Q. ii, a. 7). Hence the prohibition to receive

previous to it, for all whom this preaching has not enlightened; that is, for all those who, being in good faith, are unaware of it. Of this good faith of non-Christians we cannot judge according to the outward conditions of their lives. "We must hold as certain," said Pius IX, "that invincible ignorance is not a sin in the sight of God. Who will dare to arrogate to himself the right of determining the exact limits of such ignorance when he considers *the infinitely varied and unfathomable influence of social environment, character, and so many other circumstances upon which it depends?* [1]

90. If this be true, and on the other hand, if the statement of so eminent an authority as Mgr. de Roy be also true, that we find in all religions, even in those of the most degraded peoples, belief in an invisible world, in a Supreme Being who is Ruler and Master and Father of the world, in the survival of man who is responsible for his free acts which are morally good or evil, and above all, in the power of private and united prayer,[2] must we not acknowledge that the parasitical and corrupt development of false religions

a neophyte into the Church and baptize him until he has made an explicit Act of Faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation.

[1] Allocution "Singulari quadam," Dec. 9th, 1854. Denzinger *Enchiridion.* Editio xi, n. 1647.

[2] It is by the view taken of prayer especially, that supernatural faith is distinguished from the rational idea. Reason understands the prayer of homage, but not the prayer which is a humble appeal for assistance, because reason has a very exalted idea of man's sufficiency but a very vague, and very meagre idea of God's providence. The man who is a theist only, finds a difficulty in kneeling. Mgr. de Roy, who has not only studied the literature of the subject, but who has also spent many years amongst savage tribes, sums up the elements which are common to all non-Christian religions when those which distinguish them are eliminated:—

1a.—Distinction between a visible and an invisible world.
2a.—Notion of man's dependence face to face with this superior world, especially in regard to the employment of natural benefit.
3a.—Belief in a Supreme Being, Creator, Ruler and Master of the world who is at the same time Father to men.
4a.—Belief in independent spirits, some tutelary, others hostile.
5a.—Belief in the human soul, distinct from the body, conscious and surviving after death.
6a.—Belief in another life in which the spirits or souls survive.

has not been able completely to destroy the data of primitive revelation? However false may be the traditional cult of his country, the man who clings to it through an error of good faith, but who at the same time under the influence of that grace which is given to every one, clings with all his heart to those truths of revelation which have been preserved to him, may still possess essential Catholic belief as truly as did those monks of the desert who naively believed that God had hands and feet. The teaching of St. Thomas, therefore, that on the awakening of his moral sense, each one, provided he is faithful to grace, may make an act of faith, hope and charity which will wash away original sin, and bring him, though he is unbaptized under the influence of sanctifying grace and all it entails, is not so astonishing as it may at first appear to be. And what is to prevent such a one from doing later what he could do when he first used his free-will? He commits no sin until grace has been offered to him; yet grace may follow him up even after his first sin. If sanctifying grace should ever enter this soul, it means the supernatural religious life with its possible alternatives of sin and justification by contrition without the sacraments. And we must not forget that, for this unbaptized believer the

7a.—Universal moral sense, based upon the distinction between good and evil; sentiments of shame, justice, responsibility, liberty, duty; explicit or implicit recognition of conscience.

8a.—Prescriptions and proscriptions in view of a moral purpose, or one considered as such; notion of sin, with sanction given by the authority of the invisible world or his representatives.

9a.—Organization of worship; prayer, offerings, sacrifice, rites, ceremonies, symbols, etc., as an expression of submission, thanksgiving or supplication.

10a.—Priesthood, represented at first by the head of the family; then by the elders or by priests appointed specially for sacred functions; then by organized bodies.

11a.—Distinction between what is profane and what is sacred, affecting persons, places, objects, words, etc.

12a.—Establishment and organization of the family as the religious and social centre, seeking to preserve its purity of blood, making laws for itself, and singling itself out by special marks, strengthening itself by alliances.

La Religion des Primitifs. Paris, 1909, conclusions, p. 464.

obligations of the moral law, because of his invincible ignorance that will often excuse him, will be fewer than for the Catholic.

91. Some may say in consequence, that for the unbaptized not only is salvation possible, but that it is more easily won by them than by those who belong to the body of the Church. This is a foolish and often culpable illusion of those who know not how to appreciate the gift of God. The rickety child of the slums does not require the same amount of nourishment as the hardy mountaineer or farm labourer; but which of them is more certain of life? The facility of salvation—and this is frequently misunderstood—is not inversely but directly the consequence of the believer's delicacy of conscience, in that it is directly commensurate with his faith and the degree of supernatural life apportioned to him. The non-Christian is far less able to practise his lesser moral code and to achieve his lower destiny, than the Catholic is to observe the law of perfection and to reach that supreme degree of happiness for which God has created him. If we are to believe the Gospel, it was not the man who possessed five talents who was most tempted to bury them, but he who possessed only one. (St. Matt. xxv. 14-30.) Salvation becomes proportionately more and more difficult as the life and faith of the believer grow less. While it is very easy for those who are consecrated to God, easy also for the generality of Catholics, salvation is less easy for schismatics, difficult for heretics, more difficult still for Jews and Mahomedans, and hardest of all for pagans, those people who are enveloped in deepest shadow if not in blackest darkness, where they are in grave danger of death and have but the slightest chance of life.

92. But however easy it is for the Catholic to win salvation, he may not on that account abuse God's goodness by committing sin. God's justice is

merciful, but it is justice. Much is expected from those to whom much has been given; and if divine justice does not actually apportion to each mortal sin the eternal punishment it deserves, it punishes without hope of pardon the Sin against the Holy Ghost: "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven man, but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven." (St. Matt. xii. 31).[1] It would seem that "the blasphemy of the Spirit" was a kind of obstinacy in resisting His call, an obstinacy that is equivalent to being abandoned by grace without which it is impossible to have the sorrow that is necessary for forgiveness. The seriousness of this obstinacy is not to be measured by exterior defections only, but also, and specially, by the number and kind of graces which have been scorned. It would be extremely rash for a Catholic to cite the example of the good thief as an assurance that he would be forgiven every sin which apparently was less grave than robbery. A sacrilegious priest is nearer to committing the Sin against the Holy Ghost than the murderous Kurd. If a man would learn how he despises God's gift, let him count the graces he has received, and take note of the insistency with which he is urged to do penance. The righteous sentence which marks the beginning of this hardening of heart is mysterious, and is only revealed at the hour of death.

The obstinacy of a non-Catholic who persistently refuses to study and to accept the Catholic faith, the binding truth of which the Holy Ghost would have shown him, must also be characterized as a sin against the Holy Ghost.

[1] *Cf.* Mark iii. 28-29; Luke xii. 10; 1 St. John v. 16.

Our Lord spoke of the Sin against the Holy Ghost when the Pharisees attributed to the devil His miraculous cures of the possessed. To insult the Son of Man by treating Him as Satan's agent was a sin which could be forgiven: but to use a victory of Jesus over the devil as a pretext for flinging such an insult at Him was to give proof of a stubbornness which did not hesitate to use against the Spirit of God those very external testimonies of goodness and power by which He confirmed His interior appeal. This was a "blasphemy of the Spirit which shall not be forgiven," either in this world or the next (St. Matt. xii. 22-32).

No man is free to choose from amongst the different forms of religion the one which pleases him most: he is bound to embrace the one which grace shows him to be the true religion.

That elementary faith which may be found amongst the followers of false religions, demands and seeks its complement, so soon as it is possible to discover it. From the moment that "good faith" ceases, the doctrines and specific practices of a false worship are not only vain but blameworthy, and should be given up. The sacrifices which this entails upon the non-Catholic create a difficulty from which he is tempted to draw back. This is one of the reasons why we cannot entertain the same hope of salvation for non-Catholics as for Catholics but we entertain a hope of their salvation that is greater or less according as they appear to have been more or less in good faith, and that their religion has preserved Catholic teaching and practices in a greater or less degree.[1]

93. We can now reply to those who say it is impossible that Catholicism, which, relatively speaking is professed by a very small minority, should be the only religion authorized by an All-powerful and supremely beneficent God who has given His Son for the salvation of men.

There are indefinite degrees in the various forms of sensitive life: there are as many in the distribution of rational life: and there will be as many, perhaps

[1] This is a commentary on four propositions concerning indifference in religion condemned in the syllabus. In reply to those who say that all religions are good, and that each person may remain where he is, or choose the religion best suited to his disposition, Pius IX condemned the four following propositions:—

15a....Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

16a....Homines in cujusvis religionis cultu viam aeternae salutis reperiri, aeternamque salutem assequi possunt.

17a....Saltem bene sperandum est de aeterna illorum omnium salute, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur.

18a....Protestantismus non aliud est quam diversa verae ejusdem Christianae religionis forma, in qua aeque ac in Ecclesia Catholica Deo placere datum est. Denzinger. *op. cit.* nn., 1562-1565.

more, in the communication of God to His saints in the beatific vision. Is it astonishing, then, that in view of this future life, the Spirit who works for the deification of humanity should allow the resistance of nature and the weaknesses of reason to show themselves by certain limitations of religious life which go to fashion the several different types of the life of blessedness, from the humblest to the most sublime? The world would be less beautiful if there were only angels in it. Where would the thrones of the saints and apostles be, if there were no sinners to be saved in this world, and a multitude of blessed to be ruled in the other world, as the Archangels rule the Angels? Yet all these degrees are regulated by an influx, at once beneficent and life-giving, that is transmitted from the relatively few superior types to the many who form the lower. Civilisation has its centres from which nations receive light in a greater or less proportion according as they come within their focus. The discoveries of scientific men ever have their final echo in the lives of the lowest races. The same economy regulates the development of the supernatural life, and in particular, the conduct of the Catholic Church in the world.

94. "You are the salt of the earth" (St. Matt. v. 13). The grains of salt are but a handful compared with the mass of flesh which experiences their influence and which they preserve from corruption. The apostles and the chosen few of those real Catholics formed by the Church are not, and shall never be, more than a little flock in comparison with the multitude that Church desires to lead to beatitude. "Fear not, little flock, for it hath pleased your Father to give you a kingdom" (St. Luke, xii. 32). "In the world you shall have distress: but have confidence, I have overcome the world" (St. John, xvi. 33). The world here does not mean the assembly of sinners (Our Lord prayed for sinners; He did not pray for the world), but the

array of hostile and corrupting influences that are antagonistic to the life-giving influence of the Divine Spirit. The knowledge of the power possessed by these hostile influences of nature, sin and the devil, which, unhappily, is but too clearly shown, oftentimes plunges saintly souls into the depths of discouragement. To regain confidence the Apostles had no other incentive than the victory of Christ over death, and the triumphs of faith in the souls of the early Christians. These visible triumphs became for them the earnest of that mysterious victory which good, amid so many apparent defeats, obtained over evil. We are better off than the Apostles. The triumph of Christ is far more manifest now than it was on the day of His resurrection, but we must still learn how to measure its extent and to discover what the shadows of the mystery still enfold. It is not confined to the marvellous work of sanctifying those chosen souls who live up to the full Catholic teaching: yet there are no far-off regions, no savage nations, in which the Church has not fashioned real Catholics whose lives are a strong moralizing force even for those who persecute them. The saints are the masterpieces of the grace of Jesus Christ, but they are not its only effect; just as great men are the best products of civilisation but not the sole result. By the teaching and example of its Pontiffs, apostles and saintly souls, and far beyond their circle, the Church maintains the rights and prestige of revealed truth and ideal Christianity in the world. She exercises her vivifying, beneficent influence, not only over sinners who are her children, but also over those Churches which are separated from her, and by means of them as well as by her own apostolate over the entire world. Do we seek an example? Luther denounced religious chastity which was too heavy a burden for his sensual nature: but Lutherans have seen their mistake, and the labours of our Catholic Sisters of Charity have driven them to establish communities of deaconesses.

The separated Churches frequently reproach the Catholic Church for its unyielding spirit and its pride which will not permit it to treat with dissenting sects on equal terms. They never suspect that it is this unyielding spirit of Catholicism in preserving revealed truth which encourages and permits them to defend and safeguard whatever portion of revelation they still retain! If Catholicism were overcome: if under pretext of fraternal liberalism an acknowledgment of the legitimacy of the errors and upheavals of the past could be wrung from her: if she ceased to preach the imperative duty of each, to seek and to accept the whole truth cost what it may: if by an impossibility she ever recognized that reason possessed the right to discuss, or modify, or change divine teaching, there would be an end to all belief in revelation whatsoever. Freemasonry is fully aware of this, and therefore is the Catholic Church singled out for persecution, because it sees in her, and rightly sees, the chief power which, directly or indirectly—even if only by way of emulation—sustains all others in the conflict between good and evil, between the religious, moral life, and the corruptions of infidelity and licence.[1]

[1] This beneficent influence of the Church is, after all, nothing else than the outward side of the redeeming action of Jesus Christ. This invisible action is more efficacious and more universal in that it has preceded the institution and development of the Church entrusted to Peter. From the very beginning, no believer has surrendered himself to God's providence, or has received the particular form of revelation God has been pleased to make use of, except by the grace that was conferred in view of the merits of Calvary. "There is no salvation except in the name of Jesus."

CHAPTER XI.

The Church and Sanctity.

95.—The Church is not without blemish in this world: its moral influence affects even sinners. 96.—Fruits of sanctity outside the Church. 97.—The superior sanctity of the Catholic Church is confirmed by the uncompromising firmness of her dogmatic and moral teaching. 98.—By a comparison between the heroic sanctity of her saints and the moral infirmity of the promoters of schism and heresy. 99.—By the practice of the evangelical counsels. 100.—By the superiority of her devotedness as shown in her Apostolate. 101.—By the excellence of conversions to Catholicism. 102.—The moralizing influence of Christianity. Morality of pagan civilisations. 103.—Failure of philosophy to give a higher tone of morality. 104.—Success of Christianity. The Martyrs. 105.—Personal devotedness in the service of the poor and the outcast. 106.—Moral progress inseparable from Christianity. 107.—Deterioration of non-Christian France. 108.—Intense moral vitality of Catholic France.

95. Were we not rather flattering to ourselves when we asserted that the influence of Christianity, of which the Catholic Church is the source, was "the salt of the earth," and the strongest support that morality receives in this world? We shall now attempt to answer this question.

It is not here on earth that the Church of Jesus Christ can appear "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but . . . . holy and without blemish (Eph. vi. 26-28). Good and bad fish were taken in the Apostles' net (St. Matt. xiii. 47-48), and there is cockle in the Lord's field (St. Matt. xiii. 40-41), and evil doers in the Kingdom of the Son of Man. It was so in St. Paul's day as we may learn from the complaints in his Epistles: it will be so until the end.

To sanctify man; to wean him from the love of this earth from which he springs and to which he clings with all the tenacity of his nature; to withdraw him from the domination of animal instincts, and, what is still more difficult, from the insatiable cravings of a wholly selfish life, in order to uplift him to a divine level and bring each lower inclination into absolute submission to the love of a God Who is not only unseen but almost inconceivable, this is indeed a work impossible of full accomplishment if nature is left to her own unaided forces. We are ready to urge this plea of impossibility in excuse of our own mistakes, negligent as we are of the grace which would enable us to overcome. But we are only too apt to forget that others experience the same difficulties, and this forgetfulness prevents a just appreciation of whatever good there is in sinners, and of the virtuous actions which the Holy Spirit and the graces He bestows enables them to perform.[1] We ignore, consequently, the moral beauty that exists in the world even such as it is. If we would be just and honest, we must estimate men and things not only by a comparison with the ideal of the maximum of the life to which we are called, but also by a comparison with the sinfulness and nothingness from which God has drawn us. Below the many degrees of that integral sanctification which is the effect of grace, there is a less high morality which, though insufficient to merit eternal life, is nevertheless of efficacy and great worth, since it helps to draw down upon the sinner that mercy of God which will work his conversion. His actions are frequently performed under the influence of actual grace, and depend exteriorly upon the direct or indirect influence of Jesus, Who, having delivered Himself up that He might assure a more abundant outpouring of the

[1] Such actions do not possess that fulness of virtue which merits heaven *ex condigno;* far from being sinful, however, as Calvin, Luther and Baius maintained, they are often the fruit of actual grace which prepares the way for the sinner's conversion, while they exceed the limits of virtue possible to natural egotism.

Holy Ghost upon His Church, continues to sanctify her by His word,[1] and to prepare her little by little for that glorious sanctity, the full perfection of which shall not be hers until the trials of time and of purgatory shall have ended, and the separations which the Judgment shall cause, shall have taken place.

This truth must not be forgotten when we wish to judge the Church's influence upon the Syrian, Greek, Gallo-Roman and barbarian peoples who accepted her baptism and creed. The Gospel leaven did not change the morals of these nations in a day. As they entered the Church the proportion of sinners increased, who were soon to be found, perhaps in large numbers, among the clergy, some, even, amongst the Popes. And yet amidst these disorders, the splendour of the heroic virtue of the saints, the moral integrity of the elite of her children who became more and more numerous, the reserve and improvement amongst evil doers themselves have ever strongly testified to the principles of sanctification which energizes in the Catholic Church, and which flows from it in a greater or less degree over all Christendom.

96. In their desire to show to the best advantage the superiority of the Catholic Church in the sanctification of nations, apologists have sometimes ignored the good that is done outside the visible society of the Church, though it is not accomplished independently of the Holy Ghost. But since the soul of the Church and her faith extend far beyond the visible frontiers of the body of the Church, we need not be surprised to find her works there, though in a lesser degree, as well as the life which produces them. Let us admire and praise these works wherever we may find them; it is the homage we owe to the Divine Spirit who inspires them, and such homage will never dim for one moment the

[1] I Tim. iv, 5.

superior splendour of that sanctity which is one of the characteristics by which the Church of Rome is recognized as the Church of Jesus Christ.

97. By the sole fact that she has preserved the integrity of her Creed, and gives an unchangeable teaching to the faithful on God, Jesus Christ, prayer, grace, the Sacraments, penance, and the Last Things, the Church exercises a moralizing power superior to that exercised by all those societies in which the profession of faith is abandoned, like any philosophical system, to the continual fluctuations of individual thought, or else doubted and disputed by official teachers. To be strong, and, if necessary, heroic in the struggle which the moral life imposes upon him, man requires assured religious convictions. Nowhere will he find them as in the Catholic Church.

Conscious of this power; conscious still more of the divine assistance promised to her, the Church has never sought to make any concession to those demands which human frailty puts forward so incessantly. The absolute inviolability of the marriage-tie appeared a hard thing to preach even to the Apostles.[1] Amongst all Christian societies the Catholic Church alone has maintained it in all its fulness. Nor is this the only point upon which whatever is said, she shows herself as uncompromising and as "incapable of making concessions to human weakness" as primitive Christianity.[2] She excludes from the Sacraments all public sinners just as primitive Christianity excluded them; and if in order to keep them under the influence of her teaching she does not banish them from her assemblies; if, in order to bring them the help of sacramental grace she does not impose the same long public penances upon converts, is this to the detriment or benefit of morality?

[1] St. Matt. xix. 10.

[2] "In pagan society several vices were common which the profession of a Christianity that was still incapable of making concessions to human weakness, utterly excluded from the Church." Guignebert. *Mod. et Trad.*, p. 65.

The unyielding firmness of her moral teaching: the insistence with which she preached the doctrine of Jesus and St. Paul on the sanctifying power attached to the practice of the Evangelical Counsels by those who are called, ought, with a more abundant measure of God's grace, to produce fruits of holiness in the Catholic Church superior to anything the separated Churches could produce. This is precisely what has occurred.

98. The Separated Churches have no occasion to be proud of the sanctity of those who began the movement which established them. Michael Cerularius, Luther, Henry VIII, or Cranmer will never be held up as models of the most ordinary virtue. If we should admit that, in all probability Calvin is innocent of the immorality of which the physician Bolsec accused him, no one will seek to deny the excessive cruelty with which he maintained his theocratic and inquisitorial despotism in Geneva. The Reformation pretended to bring back the Church to its primitive holiness. Harnack, who very discreetly re-echoes in this matter the bitter and oft-repeated complaints of the founders of Protestantism, is obliged to confess that, those who were reformed have interpreted the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith and the uselessness of good works "in a most accommodating fashion": "the inevitable result was that in the reformed Churches in Germany from the very start, there were accusations of moral laxity and a want of serious purpose in the sanctification of life." The saying "If ye love me, keep my commandments," was unwarrantably thrust into the background. Not until the Pietistic movement,[1] arose, was its central importance once more recognized. Up till then the pendulum of the conduct of life took a suspicious swing in the contrary direction, out of opposition to the Catholic "justification by works."[2]

[1] From the middle of the seventeenth century.

[2] Harnack, *What is Christianity? Eng. trans.* By Thomas Bailey Saunders, p. 287. London, 1901.

While the first effects of the Reformation were a lowering of public morality in Germany, a revival of sanctity in the Catholic Church made good the harm done to her by the pagan spirit of the Renaissance. God gave her a number of saints, and great saints, to accomplish the reform of the Church which the Council of Trent had decreed and insisted upon, and to make up by their apostolic victories amongst the pagans, the losses she sustained through heresy. St. Pius V, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Philip Neri, St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Camillus of Lellis, St. John of God, St. Joseph Calasanctius, St. Teresa, St. Angela Merici, St. Catherine de Ricci, and a little later, St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul, gave a powerful impulse to the progress of sanctity amongst both clergy and people by the example of their heroic virtues and by means of the beneficent and educational institutions which they established; while in the newly discovered pagan lands a crowd of religious devoted themselves body and soul to that apostolate of which St. Francis Xavier and St. Louis Bertrand are the glory. Yet we have only given the best known names at the close of the sixteenth century.

This superiority of sanctity which so clearly came into prominence at the time of the great Protestant secession, is still the possession of the Church. To grasp the full truth of the fact, it would be necessary to examine singly the various countries in which Catholic, schismatical, and heretical Communities are to be found, subject, otherwise, to the same social and climatic influences; and, by a series of statistics, to establish for each of these communities, the co-efficient of external signs, criminality, birth-rate, attendance at Church, by which the deterioration or vigour of moral and religious life might be estimated.

We have no such statistics at hand, and would wish that an enquiry of the kind were undertaken in a sincere spirit, for we are of opinion that it would confirm the results obtained by Pastor Monod in his Berlin enquiry, which show that materialistic

socialism has made greater strides amongst the Protestants than amongst the Catholics of Germany.[1] In default of this scientific inquiry regarding the various degrees of the sanctification of the people, Protestant and Catholic, we appeal to the manifestly superior devotedness which is the product of Catholicism. There is a solidarity between chosen souls and the environment in which they are formed, and they bear testimony to the life that moulded them. This testimony is altogether in favour of the Catholic Church. However real the fruits of holiness to be found in dissenting Churches, they cannot be compared with those which are the product of that countless number of religious, nuns and missionaries, who have completely sacrificed to the service of God and the welfare of humanity all over the world, their dearest possessions, nay, their very independence,

[1] Cf. *Les Paroisses de Berlin* in *Le Christianisme au XXe siècle. Revue Protestante.* Oct. 4, 1907. [In an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* based on the Registrar-General's returns for Ireland, which shows the percentage of illegitimate births in the four Provinces, we find that Ulster comes first with 4.3 per cent.; Leinster, 2.3 per cent.; Munster, 2.2 per cent.; Connaught, 0.9 per cent. "The highest in their order of unchastity are:—Antrim, 5.8; Armagh, 5.0; Londonderry, 4.8; Down, 4.5; Tyrone, 4.0; Fermanagh, 3.5; Monaghan, 2.8; Donegal, 2-0; Cavan, 1.6. These nine counties are in Ulster. In Connaught, where the average of illegitimate births is 0.9, there are five counties Galway, 1.5 per cent.; Sligo, 1.0; Mayo, 0.7; Roscommon, 0.7; Leitrim, 0.6....Let us consider the meaning of these figures. In 1,000 persons in Banff, Scotland, there are 171 bastards; in Shropshire, 85 bastards; in Antrim, 58 bastards; in Leitrim, 6 bastards. If female chastity be virtue, then the above figures show the relative proportions between the virtue of the women of the four counties named.

What can give rise to the great difference between the chastity of the greater portion of the women of Ulster and those of the other parts of Ireland? Dividing Ulster into two portions, Protestants and Catholics, and judging these by the numbers of Protestant and Catholic marriages celebrated last year, we find the proportions to be per cent.:—

	Protestants.	Catholics.	Illegitimate Births.
Antrim	.. 80	20	5.8
Down	.. 73	27	4.5
Londonderry	.. 60	40	4.8
Fermanagh	.. 54	46	3.5
Tyrone	.. 53	47	4.0
Monaghan	.. 34	66	2.8
Cavan	.. 27	73	1.6
Donegal	.. 22	78	2.0

We have taken the above from the remarkably able book by Mgr. O'Riordan, D.Ph., D.D., D.C.L. *Catholicity and Progress in Ireland.* London, 1905. [Translator.]

and the great majority of whom keep generously the promises they have made, and win the esteem, if not the admiration, of the dissenters themselves.

Harnack admits this: "A Church . . . needs volunteers who will abandon every other pursuit, renounce 'the world,' and devote themselves entirely to the service of their neighbour; not because such a vocation is 'a higher one,' but because no Church can live without also giving rise to this desire. But in the Evangelical Churches this desire has been checked by the decided attitude which they have been compelled to adopt towards Catholicism. It is a high price that we have paid; nor can the price be reduced by considering, on the other hand, how much simple and unaffected religious fervour has been kindled in home and family life. We may rejoice, however, that in the past century a beginning has been made in the direction of recouping this loss . . . . But it must undergo a much ampler and more varied development."[1]

We also desiderate this, and without any tinge of jealousy, for we know full well that this development cannot be brought about without a greater influx of grace drawing our separated brethren nearer to the ideal, nearer consequently to unity and Catholicism. The institutes of deaconesses to which Harnack alludes, only date from the middle of the nineteenth century. Their services in Protestant hospitals are greatly appreciated, but so far they cannot compare with Catholic religious, either as regards numbers or the degree of self-sacrifice.[2] Many young girls merely spend a number of years amongst them, while preparing, and to good purpose, for their duties as mothers of a family.

100. The resumption of the apostolate which the dissenting churches abandoned completely until the

[1] *What is Christianity? ut supra,* p. 303.

[2] According to the *Realencyclopädie of Hauck*, article *Diakonissen*, Vol. IV., p. 616, there were 8,121 deaconesses in 1894.

middle of the eighteenth century, dates further back. Protestant missions developed rapidly from the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the report of the General Congress of their representatives in New York in 1900, showed that there were 6,000 missionaries, of whom 4,900 were ordained; 4,000 woman-missionaries and 700 medical missionaries. The annual budget amounted to 19,126,120 dollars= £4,781,530 and the number of converts was 4,327,283. The Russian Church has also begun its missions to the heathen, with a mission in Japan and another to Russian immigrants in North America. Their united efforts are not infrequently an obstacle to the Catholic Church, but all of them together do not equal her apostolic labours with 12,300 priests, 4,800 brothers, 17,000 sisters, and a budget, the expenses indeed, of which are lower than those of Protestant missions, but which makes up for its inferiority by the complete abnegation of her missionaries and the blessing of God, in that, excluding European Catholics who emigrated to distant countries, the number of converts from paganism during the nineteenth century amounted to 8,000,000.[1] We have no desire either to ignore or minimize the real devotedness and apostolic zeal of Protestant missionaries, which, in some cases can compare with that of Catholics. But when we bear in mind that Protestant missionaries are usually as well treated as colonial officers, can keep their families in comparative comfort, have holidays at definite periods, and an assured pension when they retire, does not the Catholic Apostolate brilliantly assert its superiority, not only from the point of the greater number of its workers, but also when we consider the utter self-sacrifice their labours entail?[2] If to the missionaries we add the religious brotherhoods, the nuns, the

[1] We give round numbers, and have taken them from the statistics compiled by Father Krose, S.J., *Katholische Missionstatistik* Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1908, p. 123.

[2] *Cf.* Pisani, *Les Missions Protestantes au XIX siècle*, in *La Quinsaine*, 16th, September to 1st, October 1901.

secular priests, and fervent laity who are as thoroughly devoted to charitable works and the apostolate at home; if we remember that there are few years which do not give us saints whose lives can bear the difficult and lengthy examination the process of canonization entails, can we really be accused of flattering ourselves when, without denying the influence of the Holy Ghost upon those members of the separated Churches who are in good faith, we assert that this influence is far more powerful, and far more fruitful in the Catholic Church?[1]

101. Do we look for another sign? In what sense does the Holy Ghost direct conversions which are really religious? Those which bear the undeniable stamp of sacrifice, which are prepared for in many cases by a fervent life, and in every case are followed by a development of the religious life that testifies to the grace which has caused them? The converts of high intellectual power and incontestable morality whom Protestantism has been unable to keep, and whom it had to yield up to the full life of

[1] It has been said that the moralizing power of Catholicism is less than that of Protestantism, since, from the economic and political point of view, the Catholic Latin nations are manifestly in a state of inferiority when compared with Protestant Anglo-Saxon countries. But is this inferiority so manifest? France is still the richest country, and she certainly is in the front rank as regards civilisation. If her economic position is less at the present day, it is not owing to Catholicism but rather to the want of it. And even supposing that this inferiority were a fact, it would be necessary, if the objection is to have any force, to show that the Christian sanctity of a people is the sole factor of prosperity. This is not the case. Sanctity is a powerful factor for economic and political prosperity on account of the natural virtues it implies; but beyond the fact that its supernatural virtues only make for the development of wealth in an indirect manner, it merely acts concurrently with an evolution in which other equally powerful factors are at work in the geographical, climatic, ethnographical and historical conditions of the different Christian peoples. Are we to blame Italy that possesses no mines, for being unable to compete with England which has so many? If the objection had any force the Mosaicism of the prophets would have been a false religion, and the Babylonian cults immeasurably superior to it. The Protestantism of the nineteenth century would have been false in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Pagan nations gauge the value of a religion in proportion to the material prosperity and political superiority of those who practise it; but this method of judging is neither the true nor the Christian one. We must insist, nevertheless, upon this fact, that false religions when they aim a blow at natural virtues, and materialism which destroys all sentiment of moral obligation, are proximate causes of economic unrest.

Catholicism, are numerous. The names of Stolberg, Frederick Schlegel, Overbeck, de Haller, Hurter, Newman, Manning, Faber, Wilberforce, Countess Hahn-Hahn, Evers, Krogh-Tonning, Joergensen are only a few of those best known.

Will any one attempt to place beside these names, those of the leaders of the *Los von Rom* movement, the pangermanist Austrians, G. Schoenerer, Karl Wolf and Eisenkolb, whose writings plead for a return to Teutonic paganism, and who regard Protestantism as a wayside inn?[1] If the secession of a few thousand Bohemian Catholics, who through hatred of the Slavs joined the political rather than religious league *Los von Rom*, has been a salutary warning to the Catholic Church in Austria, it has not strengthened Protestantism any more than the conversions amongst the working classes when there is question of mixed marriages. The Supreme Council of the Austrian Evangelical Church has no confidence in the *Los von Rom* converts, for it has learned that they practically give up all religious convictions, a circumstance which has wrung from the supporters of the movement the reply that, there is no necessity to be disturbed regarding the "chemical" purity of a religious movement, and that Luther and the early reformers did not trouble about over-nice people.[2] Nor are the German pastors better pleased with the converts who are the result of mixed marriages, since their children are generally brought up without any religion. "You take our best," Protestant ministers sometimes say, "and give us the refuse." It is true. It is not to embrace a deeper religious life that persons abandon Catholicism, but because they are tired of a life they will not live, and through some grave fault which, in depriving the guilty persons of grace, does not permit them to bring a soul but only a name to the society which receives them. There is

[1] Georges Goyau, *Vieille France, Jeune Allemagne*. iie. Partie, c. ii, p. 264.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 273-275. The concluding chapter of M. Goyau's volume is devoted to a study of the *Los von Rom* movement.

no cause for surprise, therefore, that even outwardly, such persons appear to be notoriously inferior to those amongst their new brethren who, Protestants in all good faith and thus belonging to the soul of the Church, may share in her life of grace.

In France where persons have no interest in becoming members of any of the Reformed Churches, they give up Catholicism only to become unbelievers. The French are too logical to stop half-way. "If Catholicism is lying and trickery," argues the Frenchman, "all other forms of Christianity are assuredly more so." This time M. Guignebert, Protestant that he is, will not contradict us. He has understood too well, and has insisted too often, that his co-religionists were wrong in appealing to the undemonstrable inspiration of the Scriptures to do so; while he plainly avows that, being certain he does not possess any religious truth, he is unhappily forced to seek it, without having any great hope of finding it, or any other consolation than the desire that "its name will be blessed," and that on the Last Day "its kingdom will come." [1]

102. It is towards the destruction of this Kingdom, nevertheless, that are directed all the efforts of contemporary unbelief which has risen up against God and His Christ. In those who desire to forget all that Christianity has done to uplift mankind, and keep it above the moral level of pagan society, this is ingratitude; it is also blindness, for they refuse to see that any lowering of Christian influence inevitably makes for a recrudescence of that pagan selfishness and corruption which are the immediate causes of the ruin of the highest civilisations.

An attempt has been made in our own day to rehabilitate the morals of Greece and Rome;[2] and a

[1] "Truth is first everywhere," says Tertullian. "All who seek it wherever it may be found, only desire that it may be final, and that its name may be blessed, and its kingdom come!" *Mod. et Trad.* Conclusion.

[2] Havet. *Le Christiamisme et ses Origines.* Vol. II. Paris, 1872-1884; Duruy. *Histoire des Romans.* 12e Ed. (in-8), Paris, 1885, Vol. V. *Les Moeurs,* pp. 304-381; Guignebert. *Hist. Anc. du Christ.* C. IV, pp. 126-131.

certain number of Roman ladies who were faithful wives, and some noble Romans who did not belong to the corrupt set which has been pictured for us in such scathing language in the Satires of Juvenal, Petronius, Martial and Apuleius are highly praised. We believe there were many such persons, many more, indeed, than are known, especially in the Provinces.[1] We are aware that the mockery and complaints of the satirists, moralists, and even of the Fathers of the Church cannot be accepted without question, and that side by side with the evils they stigmatized there was much unostentatious good. But we cannot forget that the mentality of the public reflects the esteem in which personal morality was held, and that the likes and dislikes of this mentality proclaim the moral decadence of pagan civilisation from the house-tops.

Its scandalous mythology is the first, but not the only, testimony. Legends of the gods served to consecrate the daily vices of their worshippers. Sodomy, for which Plato has an excuse,[2] was not a Greek vice only. It was unblushingly practised by the Romans, and its altars were to be found in all the cities of the Empire, with Antinous, the favourite of Hadrian, as its tutelary genius.[3] Fornication, of course, was considered the perfectly legitimate method of satisfying a need as natural as eating and drinking. Even St. Paul

[1] The difference between the morality of the Provinces and Rome must not, however, be exaggerated, for the theatres, circuses and public baths of far-away towns were a means of spreading Roman corruption very quickly. The distant Provinces had not been tainted in the time of Tacitus, but there was very little difference by the end of the second century.

[2] Phaedrus; Symposium.

[3] "In the days of the Republic we find that Cicero, Brutus and Caesar were suspected of this vice of which Horace boasts and Virgil sings. When Jupiter, Apollo, and even Hercules were accused of it we need not be surprised to find it practised without shame in the cities and at court. Vespasian dedicated a statue of Ganymede and placed it in a temple. Trajan brought back the mimes because Pylades pleased him; and Hadrian made a god of Antinous whose statue was placed upon the walls of every city, as if to spread the worship of this shameful and homicidal divinity." Duruy, *op. cit.*, C. LX. *Les Moeurs*, Vol. V, p. 352. *Cf.* Dollinger, *The Gentile and the Jew.* English translation, 2nd Edition. Vol. II, pp. 251-257; 288-289. London, 1906.

was obliged to protest against this erroneous idea which obtained amongst his own converts.[1] The Roman had nominally but one wife, but he could enjoy himself as he pleased with other women, provided he had no relations with another's wife. He did not, however, deny himself this pleasure. The stringent laws which were frequently promulgated against adultery were for the most part inapplicable and were not enforced; when Dion Cassius became consul there were 3,000 accusations in this matter.[2] Some women married new husbands each year, and those who did not marry more than one husband during their lifetime were so few, that their tombs

[1] 1 Cor. v. 9-11.

[2] M. Duruy in his anxiety to show that there was not such a great difference between pagan and Christian morality, says in reference to this fact: "These numbers will not appear so high for 100,000,000 men when we remember that all comers were permitted by law to play the part of accusers, and that the law itself provoked these accusations by promising a reward to the 'delator.' The laws of France, on the contrary, allow only the parties concerned to lodge a complaint. And hence of the 8,223 petitions for separation which were presented in France during 1893, 278 only gave adultery as the reason, the petitioners having preferred in presence of the judges, to appeal to other motives. The number of unhappy marriages, accompanied by public scandal, is greater amongst us than was the case in the Empire, and the reason is, that divorce was permitted in Rome" (Vol. V, p. 374). This statement, so insulting to the women of France, demands correction. 1°. The number 3,000 does not represent either the full number of accusations of the year, or those of the whole empire of 100,000,000 men, but only the accusations of the Roman freedmen, and perhaps, a very few cases from the provinces. But according to M. Duruy (*op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 116, n. 3), the population of Rome was between 1,500,000 inhabitants, of which more than half were slaves, amongst whom, as legal marriages were not recognized, there was consequently no (legal) adultery. 2° Roman law which invited the denunciation of adultery punished the accuser who was unable to substantiate his charge in the courts, with the punishment due to the accused persons. People thought twice before preferring the charge. 3°. The French law characterises a husband's infidelity as adultery; Roman law considered the infidelity of the wife only as adultery. 4°. Considering M. Paul Bureau's statement (Cf. infra. n.° 107), the number 8,223 petitions for separation in 1893 appears doubtful. But, even if we accept this number, we must remember that there were more marriages dissolved in Rome than there are unhappy ones amongst us, a fact which did not tend to the happiness of the poor husband of an unbearable wealthy wife, or of the poor wife of a rich husband, who was a libertine and a tyrant. (Duruy *op. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 34-35; Plautus, *Menechmi*, vs. 767-769), when the fear of wretchedness did not allow them to flee, and obliged them to put up with the whims of a partner who threatened by repudiating them to fling them on the streets. M. Duruy was aware of these things, but he must have forgotten them in his desire to lower the women of Christendom and of France to the level of the women of paganism.

bore the laudatory epithet of *univira*, the wife of only one husband. All shame had been lost, and amidst the obscenities applauded in the theatre and circus, the wives of Senators were to be seen giving themselves to the actors in the play.[1]

It was found necessary to make laws to oblige the citizens to marry, by taxing the unmarried and the limitation of their rights and property. "The Romans who no longer possessed strength to safeguard their freedom had sufficient to defend their vices," and Augustus had to make two attempts to enforce the *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* which had been rejected once and was introduced five years later in the dispositions of the Lex Papia Poppoea.[2] The decrease in the birth-rate amongst the free citizens was such that illegitimacy was encouraged for the sake of the offspring. "Three children, born out of wedlock, shall entitle the Latin woman to Roman citizenship and consequently to the right to the distributions."[3]

The pleasure-loving pagan had no pity for the children who were a burden. The child was no sooner born than it was flung to the dogs, if it was not acceptable to the father,[4] who always had the power to sell his son or daughter as a slave.[5] Seneca himself considered it advantageous to kill off puny children.[6]

[1] *Feminarum illustrium senatorumque plures per araenam foedati sunt*, Tacitus. *Annales*. XV. 32. Ed. Lallemand. Paris, 1760.

[2] Duruy, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 213.

[3] Duruy, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 9; Ulpian. *Lib. reg.*, III. 61.

[4] "The father's power over the child began from the moment it was born and he possessed the rights of life and death, even in the case of legitimate marriage. The new-born babe was laid at the father's feet. If he lifted it up, it was a sign that he recognized it, and the child would live: if he left it lying there, he rejected it. It was then taken away and flung into the street to die there, unless a slave dealer picked it up, and reared it for sale in the future. The father had his reasons for acting so unnaturally: First, the disquietudes of doubtful paternity, as in the case of the Emperor Claudius who ordered his daughter to be cast into the corner of a field: sometimes it was embarrassment, poverty, a large family. . . . A feeble constitution, or deformity carried their condemnation with them. . . ." Duruy, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 7-8.

[5] *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 16.

[6] *Portentosos foetus extinguimus, liberos quoque, si debiles monstrosique editi sunt, mergimus.* Seneca. *De ira.* I: 15. Girls were especially

If they treated their children so harshly, what was their treatment of the captives and slaves whom they sent to butcher each other in the amphitheatre? "The best of the Emperors, Trajan, had 10,000 captives fighting in the games which lasted one hundred and twenty-three days; Claudius brought twice as many for his naval battle on Lake Fucino, and, as these wretches were not all of them anxious to die, the legions, machines of war, catapults were requisitioned to force them to fight."[1] Behanzin did not butcher so many prisoners during his whole reign.

These facts which we have designedly taken from one who is an advocate of ancient civilisation, are not isolated crimes but public occurrences which were sanctioned by law or public opinion, and which must be regarded as the expression, or the resultant, of the morality which obtained. This does not imply that paganism had no sentiment of virtue or charity. However corrupt society may be there are still some decent people to be found, nay, even virtuous people, and the instinct of good can never wholly disappear from the most perverted heart. But how paltry this indestructible instinct appears, and how miserable its effects in pagan society compared with Christian society!

M. Duruy speaks of the virginity of a few Vestals who were gathered round their goddess in Rome, and of the subscriptions that were sometimes raised to assist the victims of public calamities. We know that under the Empire care was shown in the education of poor children in the hope of preserving some Roman blood, and that alms of corn and provisions which were not infrequently bestowed for the purposes of corruption, were distributed among the crowds of idlers in the great cities. But can the Vestals of Rome, and its alms, be mentioned in the same breath with that multitude of virgins which the

liable to be done away with, even at the end of the second century, as this text of Apuleius testifies: *Pater peregre proficiscens mandavit uxori suae, ut si sexus sequioris edidisset foetum . . . necaretur* (*Metamorph.* X).

[1] Duruy, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 344.

Church has given to every country in the world, and has consecrated, not only for the alleviation but the uplifting of every sorrow? Renan finds no difficulty in accounting for the absence of charitable institutions amongst the ancients, and it is with the serenity of pagan cynicism that he writes:—"In the depths of antiquity it can be said that the world had no need of charity. The world was young then, and brave; the hospital was useless. . . . Man at that epoch was still sane and happy; he could not take account of evil."[1] Such egotistical language is worthy of an epicurean in the days of Augustus.

103. Paganism too had its teachers of morals, the most illustrious of whom were the Stoics. These teachers expressed in eloquent terms the instincts of goodness, justice and energy which are ineffaceably rooted in the human heart. They were not only sought after, but they were a power for many years, and the best of them, Marcus Aurelius reigned twenty years. What was the result of this philosophical rule as regards the betterment of morality in the empire? We shall be pardoned for giving Renan's passionately blasphemous avowal of the shameful failure of philosophical government: "What a horrible deception for virtuous folk! . . . Now it is after the greatest effort in administrative rationalism ever made, after eighty-four years of an excellent government, after Nerva, Trajan, Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, that the reign of evil begins again, worse than ever. Farewell, virtue; farewell, reason! Since Marcus Aurelius has been powerless to save the world, who shall save it? In the meantime, hurrah for the mad men! hurrah for the absurd! Welcome to the Syrian and his dubious gods! Serious physicians have been unable to do aught. The sick man is worse than ever. Bid the quacks hither; better than honourable practitioners they know what the people want. The saddening feature of the situation,

[1] *Les Apotres.* Eng. trans. c. xvii, p. 119.

indeed, is that the death day of Marcus Aurelius, so mournful for philosophy and civilisation, was an auspicious day for Christianity.[1]

104. But while the reign of philosophers only succeeded in bringing back the evil days, the leaven of the Gospel continued its work of multiplying in a pagan atmosphere, numbers of souls whom it snatched from the corruptions of the world and inspired with the ideals of purity and charity. The most striking testimony to the new spirit which it gradually infused into the world, is, without any doubt, the heroism of the martyrs. For the dulled pagan world it was the most eloquent of sermons, and it is still in our eyes one of the signs of that divine power which makes Christianity a vital force. From motives of pride and obstinacy a man may prefer death to the public and humiliating disavowal of a teaching of which he has posed as the prophet; like Cranmer he may exhibit fearlessness in presence of death after he has vainly tried by cowardly and hypocritical abjurations to escape from punishment; or like the Indian fakirs, in a moment of mystical exaltation he may torture and even kill himself; we are aware of this. But this is not martyrdom.

The real martyrs, those who gave manifest testimony to God for Whom they died, and to the divine strength which quickened them, are neither proud, headstrong prophets, nor fanatics who kill themselves, or kill others, caring not if they themselves be killed, like the soldiers of Islam or anarchists. They are humble believers who have given themselves without reservation to God in Whom they hope, and who accept in all simplicity, piously and gently, the most cruel tortures and death itself, not "to show themselves to men, but that men might see God."[2]

[1] *Marc. Aurèle.* Eng. trans. by W. G. Hutchinson, p. 244.

[2] "The martyr is not merely one who is the victim of violence. Hard as it may seem to be, it would be too little. It is not the sufferings or the insults that count, but the manner in which they are borne. It is

Their heroism is not a momentary exaltation but one which lasts weeks and months. Long captivity and work in the mines did not extinguish it. Can it be found amongst non-Catholics outside the body of the Church? Why not? Why can it not be found wherever the Holy Ghost listeth, wherever He inspires with essential Catholic belief, that supernatural charity which gives superhuman power to die for this faith, though there should be invincible ignorance regarding the explicit developments which this faith entails?

But if the Holy Ghost can raise up from amongst men, real martyrs who belong only to the soul, while, being in good faith they are outside the body of the Church. He knows how to bear testimony to the incomparable superiority of the life with which He has endowed the Catholic Church. The few heroic deaths, which, amongst non-Catholics have had the appearance, and, perhaps the real merit, of true martyrdom, are merely gleanings in comparison with the rich harvest of heroic souls who have been nurtured in the bosom of the Church, from Stephen who died praying for his murderers, to the martyrs of Japan, China, Tonkin, and Uganda, who gave their

the dispositions which make the martyr, and these are of the soul, not of the body. To die with hatred or contempt in the heart, blaspheming either in defiance of men, or merely through pride and ostentation, is not to die as a martyr, whatever may be the cause that is championed. In such a case, a man merely bears testimony to himself and to nothing else. He concentrates himself upon his own miserable individuality; and, even in the supreme moment, merely rises up against everything else, and succeeds only in establishing his own powerlessness more clearly. But to die forgiving his executioners, praying that his death may make them see the light which interiorly enlightens him ; to die, not only without hatred or anger, but with gentleness and love, not for the sake of showing himself to men but that men may see God, this is to be indeed a martyr. For then, by the death which is accepted, by the sacrifice so calmly made of his temporal individuality, a man bears witness to an undying reality in which he is assured that neither existence nor life shall be wanting. He rises above hatred, above death, nay, masters them, and despite them, he affirms love and life." L. Laberthonnière *Le témoignage des Martyrs*, in the *Annales de philosophie chrètienne*, Oct. 1906. pp. 85-86. Fallen man is not capable of this absolute, religious self-surrender, unless by means of supernatural assistance, which can only be given him for the defence of belief which is Catholic and essentially supernatural, the belief in God Who is the Saviour of those who trust in Him. In an Appendix (II), we shall show in the narrative of the first Martyrs of Gaul, the type of Christian Martyrs.

lives as gladly for the conversion of their countrymen. No period of Christianity has been without its martyrs; but the first pages of its long history which tell of the Roman persecutions, are the most wonderful. Amidst the widespread corruption of paganism, "the fact that sufferings so various and often so appalling, were borne, not merely for a short time when enthusiasm was contagious, but during well-nigh three centuries by thousands of men, women, and even children, who belonged to countries widely apart, from whom a word, or some slight sign, would have been sufficient to have put an end to these tortures, and who, in consequence, accepted them resolutely and gladly . . . . is a unique fact which cannot find its equal in the annals of any religion or of any people."[1] Is it too great a demand upon us to believe the martyrs when they tell us that God sustained their courage and their hope?

105. But Christianity not only gave strength to die heroically but to live a good life. Not every Christian is a saint it is true, but the example of the saints whom Christianity has formed, the preaching of the Gospel and God's grace, converted sufficient sinners, or at least taught them sufficient self-restraint, to accomplish what royal Stoics had attempted in vain, namely, to raise very considerably the moral tone of the nations to whom the Gospel was preached. If Christianity has "imposed a reserve upon our errors that urges us to keep up appearances as M. Guignebert asserts,[2] the reason is that Christianity has made virtue sufficiently common, and consciousness of evil sufficiently keen, to prevent these errors from asserting themselves. The restraint which is put upon evil, and which, as we see for ourselves, becomes relaxed according as the Christian convictions of the individual or of society

[1] Paul Allard, *Dix lecons sur le Martyre*, pp. 306-307, quoting the masterly article by M. L'Abbe Rivière. *Autour de la question du martyre*, in the *Revue pratique d'apologetique*, Avril 15, 1907.

[2] *Hist. Anc. du Christ*, c. iv, p, 128.

grow less, is not the only thing which marks the progress of Christianity. Christianity has accomplished more than this. By the continual, energetic practice of Evangelical charity with which it has inspired the saints, Christianity has developed in the human race to a degree unknown to ancient civilisation, the sentiment of the duty of each individual to assist and support the weak instead of crushing them, the sentiment of a practical brotherhood amongst nations.

We are told that this progress is not due to Christianity; that fraternity is just as much the ideal of unbelievers as of believers; and that the moral betterment, the honour of effecting which we claim, is owing to Christian influences, is nothing more or less than the effect of the material civilisation and higher evolution of the Western nations. These pretensions cannot be upheld, for facts of which we have experience, contradict them in a sadly striking manner. If the development, and above all, the practical working of this brotherhood of natural interests is not owing to Christianity, how is it that purely secular philanthropy sinks to the level of that of the ancients, lives on the public purse, and while demanding pecuniary assistance is incapable of arousing personal and disinterested devotedness. All are agreed, both believers and unbelievers, that lay nurses have not been so successful in the hospitals as the nuns; yet many of these lay nurses are Christians, or are under the influence of the Christian spirit. Let this influence decrease, however, and the confidence which those who have laicised the hospitals place in larger salaries, will mean another deception for themselves, and a decrease of that fraternal assistance which the charity of Christ crucified had assured to the sick.

106. If the moral superiority of Christian nations is the effect of civilisation and the fruit of race instincts, why does this superiority not advance with the advance of civilisation? How is it that

where there is a lowering of the influence of Christianity there is also a speedy lessening of this superiority?

Writing as we do for the people of France we only give French statistics; but a reference to the statistics of other countries will show a similar condition of things.

We are as thoroughly French as we were twenty-five years ago, and the social conditions are not materially different; but, for manifold reasons which we cannot now examine, except to draw attention to the oppression of a Government that desires to see what a State without religion is like, the influence of Christianity over the minds and hearts of the French people has been considerably lessened. What has been the result? The people are rapidly reverting to the morality of the worst days of pagan Rome. Facts are too evident to permit any one to doubt that the increase of sensual corruption and selfishness corresponds to the weakening of Christian influence.

107. Our thinkers and our literary men do not yet attempt to justify sodomy openly, but "this vice no longer hides itself; it too (like prostitution), has its places of resort, and there are certain cafés in the Capital where select literary and artistic circles meet daily, when an agreeable conversationalist, not infrequently a man who is decorated with the Legion of Honour, discourses upon the exquisite delight of sensations that are unknown to the vulgar crowd."[1]

Wives who are faithful to their first husband are not yet so rare that we need to inscribe upon their tombstone the glorious epithet *univira*—as a sign of exceptional virtue; but we are rushing towards the instability of pagan family life. Separations *a thoro*, in the years which preceded the Divorce Law, from 1876 to 1880, amounted on an average to 3,360.

[1] Paul Bureau, *La Crise Morale des Temps Nouveaux*. c. ii, 3rd Ed., Paris, 1908, p. 31.

In 1903, there were 8,919 divorces and 2,320 separations, giving a total of 11,239.[1]

In 1909, the divorces alone amounted to 12,874,[2] but there are no statistics of the number of separations.[3] Under the influence of a corrupt literature which seeks not merely "to excuse but to justify, to legitimize, and to establish by reason and right the veriest caprices or the wildest excesses of luxury,"[4] the people are losing day by day all respect for the marriage tie. In 1903, two novelists, the brothers Margueritte, without meeting with any serious protest, were able to present a petition to the Chamber of Deputies in which they demanded that divorce might be granted not only by mutual consent, but "at the request of one of the married couple, when such a one had given expression to his or her desire three times with a year's interval."[5]

If our theatres are not yet so low as the Roman circus they are nearly so. M. Emile Faguet of the French Academy, who is not a Catholic,[6] and has never been accused of exaggerated prudishness, complains that, in twenty years, playhouses in which "pornology approximates to, if it does not surpass, pornography" have taken the place of the theatres where the rules of modesty were more or less respected. "If obscenity has taken possession

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[2] *Journal Officiel*, Juin 8, 1910.

[3] ["The reviewer in the *Literary Churchman* (English), 12th October, 1883, says: 'Among Protestants or non-Roman Catholics the divorces occur; and these run up to as high a rate as 1 divorce to every 14 marriages in Massachusetts, and in Connecticut to 1 in every 8. The practical result of this facility of divorce is that in the New England States alone families are broken up at the rate of 2,000 every year.' *Catholic and Protestant Countries compared.* Alfred Young, C. S. P., p. 546. New York, 1898. 'In Canada during 1900 there were eleven divorces; in 1901 nineteen. In England there were 284 in 1902 as compared with 177 in 1901. In Germany at the same time there were about 10,000 annually, and in France 21,939, with a tendency towards a rapid increase. "Divorce" by Walter George Smith in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. V. Translator."]

[4] Paul Bureau, *op cit.*, p. 102.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[6] M. Faguet died a most edifying death as a Catholic in July, 1916. Tr.

of the theatre," he continues, "the reason is that public modesty has disappeared."[1] It is a disquieting symptom of the state of men's minds and hearts if it be true that, as Sainte-Beuve remarked, social life imitates the theatre far more than the theatre imitates society.

[1] *La Pornologie au Théatre,* in *La Croix,* Aug. 13th, 1908. We give the following extracts from this article:—

"I say pornology and not pornography, for there is a difference. The writer who corrupts; the story-teller, novelist, compiler of memoirs, or any other, addresses himself to you alone, *tête à tête,* through his writings. The writer who corrupts by means of the theatre, speaks to you, puts his vice in a dialogue and his infamy into words that pass from mouth to mouth, and from the tongue to the ears of the public. This is pornology, and it is a thousand times worse than pornography.

Twenty years back I set myself to defend the theatre, and for the following reasons.

The theatre is a place where we enjoy ourselves in public, men and women together. Now there is a collective spirit which, without being excellent, is better than individual spirits, or the sum of individual spirits. When persons who are not very moral are assembled together, they form a collective entity that is sufficiently moral. When persons who are not very modest come together, they form a collective entity that is punctiliously modest. . . . Experience proves this. . . .

And I concluded imperturbably that the theatre had no secret chambers of shame, and that those who poured out their vituperation upon it were in error. . . .

But, *four lustrums have passed, and things have changed completely. Pornology has taken possession of the theatre, and approximates to, if it does not surpass, pornography.* The theatre has no reason to be jealous of the book, while the obscene novel may now hail the theatre as its brother.

. . . . It is a sign of the times. What preserved the theatre from obscenity was this collective sense of which I have spoken, the respect that the members of the audience had for each other, in a word, public. If obscenity has invaded the theatre it is because public modesty has disappeared. . . .

The seriousness of this is very grave, for it means that a certain kind of conscience has also disappeared. I am well aware that the true conscience makes no distinctions, and abhors obscenity in private as much as in public. . . . It makes no distinction between pornology and pornography, and I should cry *mea culpa* for having made this distinction myself. Still it is something when people will not allow themselves to be treated with contempt in public. . . This superficial modesty is still modesty. . . . It is a species of conscience, insufficient indeed, but a species of conscience whatever may be said. . . . It is just this species of conscience that no longer exists. It is this skin-deep conscience which is no more. Where is the real conscience?

Sign of the times I have said, and a terrible sign it is. *In hoc signo victus eris.* By this sign shall you be overcome; not only overcome but buried in filth.

. . . It is disquieting to recall the words of Sainte-Beuve. Before his time men said: 'The theatre imitates life.' 'Oh!' he replied, 'life imitates the theatre far more.' God help us if this be true. If life to-day is an imitation of the theatre of to-day, the very thought is one to make us shudder."

We have not yet admitted that it is permissible for parents to fling their children to dogs when these children become a burden ; but the juries are becoming more lenient towards infanticide. In 1880 the proportion of acquittals was 26 per cent.; it was 42 per cent. in 1902.[1] "Abortion is quite common in certain large towns and industrial centres and to such an extent is it practised that, according to the profound statement of a novelist, the majority of illegitimate children who are reared, are to be found only amongst those persons who have remained respectable and honest![2] The progress of surgery having practically robbed ovariotomy of its dangers,

[1] The number of infanticides remanded to the Assizes from 1881-85 was 879, while there were only 535 cases in the period 1896-1900. The decrease would be an encouraging sign if the Official Report did not furnish the purely administrative reason for it. "The magistrates, in the face of the systematically negative verdicts of the jury, determined to penalize all attempts upon the life of the child. We cannot infer, then, from the number of cases tried in the courts that any real amelioration had taken place." *Journal Officiel*, September 20th, 1902, p. 6424 *ap.* Paul Bureau, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[2] Paul Bureau, *op. cit.*' p. 34. On page 106 we read: "In the Autumn of 1906 a physician who shall be nameless, published a book with the title: *Le droit à Avortement*. It was favourably reviewed in the magazines, several of which insisted upon the duty incumbent upon us of criticizing severely our *atavic prejudices*."

[We give the following extracts from the Report of the Royal Commission on Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods, of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, vol. i., 1907. "It is everywhere conceded that her (Mrs. Annie Besant) pamphlet, sold by the hundred thousand, urging the practice of what Dr. Bergeret properly calls 'genesic frauds,' of artificial interferences with the sexual function, was the real and proximate cause of the decline in Anglo-Saxon productiveness. It has cost Australia already more than a million lives, many of whom would have been mature citizens of our own flesh and blood." (Par. 8, p. 10.)

"In the battle of Leipzig, the bloodiest of modern times, were lost nearly 20,000 lives. That number corresponds with the annual deficit in baby lives in Great Britain alone." (Par. 20, p. 12.)

"Large as is the area of the Australian continent, it is impossible that its people will ever become truly great under the conditions affecting the increase of population which now obtain. Immigration has practically ceased to be an important factor, the maintenance and increase of population depending upon the birth-rate alone, a rate seriously diminished and still diminishing." Extracts from a paper on the Decline of the Birth-Rate in N. S. W., by Mr. T. A. Coghlan, p. 38, as given in the Report, p. 60.

	Actual Corrected Birth-rate.		
Countries	1889-1	1902-4	Decline per cent.
Belgium	40.8	31.0	24
Germany	40.4	35.3	12
Norway	40.1	37.8	6

numbers of women have recourse to it for the sole purpose of escaping the inconveniences of motherhood.[1] Finally, the use of preventatives is becoming more and more general. The births in 1880 were 245 per 10,000. " In 1907, the number of births registered at the time when the children were still alive amounted to 773,969; there were, moreover, 36,760 children who were either still-born or who had died before registration of birth, which gives a total of 810,729. The proportion, calculated in connection with the numbers of the legal population . . . was about 207 per 10,000. With regard to the children declared to be living, the numbers in 1907 are 32,878 less than the corresponding numbers for 1906, and 65,874 less than the annual average of the period 1896-1905. The proportion per 10,000 inhabitants was 197 in 1907; 205 in 1906; 206 in 1905; 209 in 1904; 211 in 1903; 216 in 1902; and

Country.	1889-1	1902-4	decline per cent.
Scotland ..	.. 39.3	33.4	15
Austria ..	.. 30.0	38.5	1
Denmark ..	.. 38.9	33.1	15
New South Wales	.. 38.8	26.5	32
Sweden ..	.. 38.5	36.2	6
Italy ..	.. 36.9	33.7	9
New Zealand	.. 36.7	29.6	19
Victoria ..	.. 36.0	27.0	25
Ireland	.. 35.2	36.1	3 (Increase).
England ..	.. 34.6	28.4	18
Towns			
Hamburg ..	.. 35.0	25.4	27
Edinburgh	.. 35.0	28.0	20
Berlin ..	.. 35.1	21.9	34
Dublin ..	.. 32.2	35.4	10 (Increase).
London ..	.. 32.2	26.8	17
Paris ..	.. 23.3	16.6	28
Melbourne	.. ....	24.1	....
Sydney ..	.. ....	23.9	....

ibd, p. 46. Translator.]

[1] "In a paper read before the Faculty of Medicine at Paris in 1896, Dr. Canu stated that ovariotomy had caused more damage to France in ten years than the shells of '70.' In an interview published in L'Eclair, July, 1896, he declared that, 'in Paris, during a period of fifteen years, from 30,000 to 40,000 operations of this kind had been performed; and that there were 500,000 women in France who had undergone this operation." It would be hard to discover how many of these operations were performed with an immoral purpose; but it is known that the number is large, and that in the world of pleasure persons have had frequent recourse to this discovery of surgical science." Paul Bureau, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

220 in 1901." [1] The decrease continues rapidly. If it is not stayed we shall be compelled to offer a reward to prostitutes who consent to bear children, as was the case in the Rome of Augustus, "for in 1907 the deaths exceeded the births by 19,320."

The progress of immorality makes for that of criminality which is daily increasing, and, what is certainly significant, is greatest amongst the youth which has been educated in secular schools. It has been found necessary to remove the names of a large number of children from the police-court list, and to send the culprits either to their own homes or to reformatories. Such indulgence, prompted by the desire of correcting the culprits more effectually, has merely caused a temporary discontinuance of the increase in the numbers of juvenile criminals. The Keeper of the Seals in his Report, 5th March, 1907, had to admit that, "the maximum of criminality is to be found, in the case of men as of women, amongst criminals of the ages of sixteen to twenty." [2]

We think it well to give the evidence furnished by a few prison reports in America in confirmation of the foregoing statements.

[1] Extract from the *Journal Officiel*, Juin, 16, 1908. The statistics for 1880 are taken from the Official returns as given by Paul Bureau, *op. cit.* pp. 53-54. The decline of Christian faith is not the sole cause of the decline of the birth-rate. The difficulties occasioned by the development of badly-paid officialism, the laws regarding legacies, and the spread amongst the democracy of those luxurious habits which were formerly the monopoly of the wealthy classes, etc.... make some married Christians live a life of continence, and drive others, unhappily, to yield to the criminal pleasures of onanism. But this vice from which some Christian families find it difficult to abstain, reigns supreme where Christianity has disappeared, and is commensurate with its disappearance. The provinces which show the largest birth-rate are those which have best preserved their Christian traditions.... Beyond the fact that other causes influence the birth-rate than those which affect morality, it must be remembered that intentional sterility is a sign of the immorality of over-refined peoples."

The *Journal Officiel* Juin 18, 1910, shows a still further decrease in the birth-rate during 1909; it is less by 3,676 than in 1908.

[2] M. Henri Joly, Member of the Academy of Moral Science, writes on the subject of juvenile crime with reference to the Report of 1907: "At present, the age, relatively speaking, against which the largest number of criminal charges appear, is that of sixteen to twenty-one. In 10,000 the proportion of criminals above 21 years of age 2.7 accusations and 16.3 convictions, while the proportion under that age is 3.7 and 18.8 respectively." *Le Probléme criminel au moment présent*, in the *Revue de Deux Mondes*, 1st December, 1907, p. 704.

STATE PRISONS OF NEW YORK, 1890.

Sing-Sing Prison.

Educated	1,420	went to Public Schools	1,403
Illiterate	133	„ „ other Schools	17
Total	1,553		

Auburn Prison.

Educated	1,025	went to Public Schools	545
Illiterate	126	„ „ other Schools	480
Total	1,151		

Clinton Prison.

Educated	711	went to Public Schools	637
Illiterate	93	„ „ other Schools	74
Total	804		

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia State Penitentiary, 1890-92.

1890. Prisoners received. 527.

Educated	462	went to Public Schools	382
Illiterate	65	„ „ Private Schools	80
		„ „ no School	65
Total	527	Total	527

Went to both Roman Catholic and other Schools	12
„ only to Roman Catholic Schools	13
„ to all other Private Schools	55
Total	80

1892. Prisoners received. 474.

Educated	418	went to Public Schools	361
Illiterate	56	„ „ Private Schools	57
		„ „ no School	56
Total	474	Total	474

Went to Roman Catholic and other Schools	18
„ only to Roman Catholic Schools	14
„ to all other Private Schools	24
Total	57
Convicts 21 years of age and under	87
Went to Public Schools	62
„ „ other Schools	18
„ „ Roman Catholic Schools	7

We have taken the above statistics from the work by Alfred Young, C.S.P., *Catholic and Protestant Countries compared,* New York, 1898, pp. 451-452. Translator.

Need we be astonished at this when we remember that there is no moral teaching in our State schools, and that God is deliberately ignored and denied? While our most prominent University professors cast about in vain for a basis for their independent morality, and each day furnish moral scepticism with new weapons by parading their denials and contradictions, the reviews which have the largest circulation amongst our primary teachers, draw the practical conclusions from the anarchy that reigns in our High Schools. The following extracts from the *Revue de l'Enseignement Primaire* which counts 40,000 subscribers among our teachers, men and women, will give point to our statements. M. Maurice Boucher gives his instructions to teachers in the following lines:

> "Our bounden duty is to be bold.
> Our generation has sufficient pride
> To plumb undismayed, the black abyss of the heavens,
> And pluck from it this God, as one would pluck a blade of grass." (18th October, 1903).

It is not God only, but the very idea of duty, and of duties the most sacred, of which these men seek to rob the child. We give another extract: With progress "the voice of conscience is destroyed and the notion of duty obscured . . . . Duty no longer binds . . . . If the categorical imperative was good it is no longer necessary. We do not regret that the honest man who questions his conscience has been relegated to the pantheon of entities, and has been placed in the museum amongst the buddhas who sit contemplating their middle." In another number, M. Hervé writes: "Away with restraint . . . We shall see the imbecile prejudices disappear, those especially which refer to the relations of the sexes, for they are the inheritance of centuries of ignorance and superstition." [1]

[1] These two extracts from the *Revue de l'Enseignement Primaire*, are taken from the discourse of Mgr. Baudrillart at the Diocesan Congress of Toulouse 13th May, 1918, given in the *Revue du Clergé Français*, 15 September 1908. Cf. *Les Instituteurs sans foi, sans famille, sans patrie*, in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologetique*, 1st August 1908; *L'Ecole*

Paganism was not acquainted with this form of organized demoralisation,—the obligatory primary school under the direction of teachers, a large number of whom are materialists of the lowest type.

108. Are we to give way to despair? Are we to believe that the Franks are swiftly rushing to ruin, the ruin which overwhelmed the peoples of old, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, whose decrepitude was caused by the havoc wrought by those vices which were the result of the diffusion of wealth and aesthetic culture? Far from us be the thought. The ancient civilisations did not possess the principle of life and rejuvenation which Christian peoples possess, and which none as yet have completely abandoned. The crisis of materialism and corruption from which we now suffer, is not graver than those crises which have already occurred and of which it is but a periodic return: the crisis of Manicheism in the twelfth century; of the Rennaissance in the sixteenth century, and of the Encyclopedists in the eighteenth century. Now, as then, the moral life lived by Catholic France which has still held to its traditions, is not only the sign of the Church's sanctity as shown when her devotedness and sacrifices are contrasted with the egotism and sensualism of the masses of unbelievers and the indifferent, it is vigorous enough to enable us to predict that, one day it will regain its influence and the position it held in the past, under another form.[1]

The Church in France, surprised for the moment by the new tactics of the propaganda of blasphemy and immorality that has robbed her of so many souls, has settled down again under the violence of legal persecution. Not only has the loyalty of her

d'aujourdhui, by M. Goyau; *La Mentalité laïque et l'école*, by Père Lescoeur.

[1] Has not this prediction been verified during the present Great War? It certainly would seem that a new spirit quickens the people of France, and that, inspired by the example of the heroic soldier-priests and chaplains who have carried on an apostolate in the trenches which is worthy of Catholic France in her most glorious days, the Eldest Daughter of the Church is coming back once more to her Mother. Translator.

children given back to her the confiscated Seminaries and Episcopal Houses; not only have the needs of the clergy who were deprived of all assistance from the Budget of Public Worship, and despoiled of the income accruing from pious foundations, been provided for by the charity of the faithful, but the work of safe-guarding religion and that of the apostolate has increased. The religious missionary congregations which sheltered so many generous souls were suppressed and dispersed. The blow was as severe as the privations of the exiles were great. But Catholic enterprise would not be crushed, and it has given proof of its marvellous vitality by its wonderful activity.

The schools that were closed are being re-opened, and Christian teachers occupy the places left vacant by the exiled religious. Everywhere we see clubs, societies, and social unions springing up, quickened by the spirit of Catholicism. Conferences to men, either in the Church or public halls are on the increase. The apostolate of the Press is vigorously carried on, and the readers of, and subscribers to, Catholic papers and reviews are more numerous than ever.[1]

[1] It would be impossible to furnish statistics for all France which show how the persecution the Church has had to suffer at the present time has awakened the activity of Catholics anew. Canon Couget has supplied us with a short summary of the work done in the Archdiocese of Paris alone.

1a. *Apostolic work.* From 1886-1908 the Diocesan Missionaries gave 440 Missions lasting from three to four weeks each. The estimated number of those who gave up their evil ways as the effect of these Missions is 40,000. About 200 men attend the Conferences that are given in almost every parish; while the circulation of Catholic parish magazines amounts to 90,000 and more each month.

2a. *Educational work, and work for the protection of youth.* Practically all the secondary schools that were closed on the dispersion of the religious have been re-opened. The majority of the primary schools also have been re-established in the various parishes, thanks to the *Association des Instituteurs privés du Diocèse de Paris* for the masters, and the *Union Catholique des Dames de l'Enseignement* for the mistresses. Two Training Colleges for girls have been opened. In 1908 the Archdiocese of Paris had 207 free Primary Schools, 97 for boys, 110 for girls, with an attendance of 45,610 pupils, 16,754 boys, and 28,856 girls.

3a. *Charitable and Social Work.* These are innumerable in Paris, and we can only mention the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; the Union for the Sanctification of the Sunday; the Catholic Workmen's Clubs; the Syndicates of Workers and Employees; the Co-operatives; the Anti-alcoholic Unions; the Catholic Railway Workers' Union, etc.

We must draw attention, however, to a falling off in vocations to the priesthood which would be a serious matter if it were to continue. On the other hand, the aspirants to the Religious Orders whose numbers grew less at the beginning of the struggle, have increased again; and we feel confident that the same will occur in the case of the secular clergy who have been only momentarily disturbed by the troubles of the Church. Yet, despite the increased monetary burdens that press upon the Catholics of France, on account of the spoliation of the clergy and the new works which have been undertaken for the defence of religion, they still subscribe 3,123,460 francs more than all other countries together to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. This sum represents but a small portion of what is subscribed for charitable works outside France, by a country which has practically neither immigrants nor colonists, but which, even in the most savage countries, still possesses its Missionaries, its Teaching Brothers, its Sisters of Charity, and its Apostolic and Charitable Institutions.

And so we can quite understand how His Holiness Piux X. could say that France caused him his greatest anxiety, while she was at the same time the source of his greatest consolation; and that he hoped that better days would dawn, when Catholic France would reap the reward of her loyalty.[1] Catholic vitality in France to-day justifies this hope. The day is not far distant when the bitter experience of the past, and God's grace, will teach the democracy of France and the world, that Catholicism, the true "salt of the earth," is far more necessary to individuals and to nations than the most advanced civilisation which allows full sway to the corrupt and selfish instincts of man.

[1] Address to the Students of the French Seminary at Rome, June 10th, 1908.

CHAPTER XII.

The Church and Miracles.

109.—Confidence of the Primitive Church in the argument from Miracles. 110.—Miracles prove nothing to the unbeliever; they are non-existent for him. 111.—Renan's challenge. 112.—Lourdes the reply to it: Pierre de Rudder. 113.—Marie Lemarchand. 114.—Gabriel Gargam. 115.—Brief statistics. 116.—Miracles can no longer be denied *a priori*. 117.—Protestantism and the miraculous. 118.—Paganism and the miraculous. 119.—The "miracles" of Esculapius. 120.—The objection of "unknown forces." 121.—How the supernatural intervention of God is seen in the miraculous. 122.—Definition of a miracle. 123.—Its apologetic significance. 124.—How it may be withstood.

109. To the testimony of the fruits of sanctity which the Holy Ghost has so wonderfully produced in the Catholic Church, God has willed to add the further testimony of miracles.

"And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover. And the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God. But they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed." (St. Mark xvi. 17-20.)

Were these verses written by St. Mark the Evangelist or by Aristion the Presbyter? Are we to regard them as the literal reproduction of the Master's last words? or are they only the traditional expression of His final promises? These questions belong to Scriptural criticism and exegesis; but however they may be answered it is historically certain that, in the early days of Christianity, the

redactor of this Gospel and its readers were persuaded that miracles were wrought and would continue to be wrought in the Church, and that these miracles were an authentic sign of the true faith. Has their confidence been betrayed? Is their appeal to the miraculous well founded?

110. "In the judgment of an unbeliever the miracle proves nothing, for it is non-existent. If it were existent, of what use would it be? Every religion that has desired them has found miracles at its service. At the period when Christianity was being diffused over the Roman Empire the miraculous was current coin in every temple; while a temple of Esculapius, of Apollo, Isis or Tanit, bore striking resemblance to one of our great sanctuaries where thaumaturgy flourishes, the same ex-votos covered the walls, the same inscriptions announced the same divine favours."[1]

Unbelief, therefore, presents a double denial to the Catholic doctrine of miracles; a miracle is non-existent, but if it does exist its evidence is worthless! We hope to show that this twofold denial is not the result of criticism but of pharisaical obstinacy, and that the miracle, regarded by contemporaries as a reality, bears highest testimony to the truth of Catholicism. We do not say it is a mathematical proof; we do claim that it is a sign which shows forth the supernatural intervention of God as far as such intervention can be made manifest in sensible experience.

111. Unbelief thought that miraculous events or facts might be denied without more ado.

"Incidents of this nature have never been verified. All alleged miraculous episodes, when closely scrutinised, resolve themselves into illusion or imposture. Were a single miracle proved we could not reject in the lump all those recorded in ancient histories; for, after all, even admitting that a very great number of these were false, we might still believe that

[1] Guignebert, *Mod. et Trad.*, pp. 62-63.

some were true. But it is not thus. All miracles capable of being discussed vanish into thin air.... When there is such a simple means of proof, why not make use of it in the light of day? A miracle performed at Paris before competent scientific observers would put an end to so many doubts! But, alas! that is just what never happens. Never has a miracle occurred before the public which needs conversion—I mean, before the sceptical. The condition of the miracle is the credulity of the witness. No miracle has ever been manifested before those who would have been capable of discussing and criticising it. To this there is not a single exception. Cicero remarked, with his customary good sense and shrewdness: 'Since when has this secret force disappeared? May it not have been since men have grown less credulous?"[1]

Renan wrote these words when he was as yet unaware of the wonders that would be wrought by the water which sprang up beneath the fingers of the peasant-girl of Lourdes and the invocation of the Virgin-Mother who appeared amongst the rocks of Massabielle. Unbelief will see nothing but the pious exaggeration of the enthusiasm of the first Christians in these words attributed to Jesus by St. Matthew: "Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen. The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the Gospel preached to them. And blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in Me." (xi. 4-6.) The sweet and powerful glance of Jesus, the suggestion of His authoritative word were able to cure many who were sick, those neurotics especially who men said were demoniacs; but, according to the judgment of unbelievers, Jesus could never have given sight to any one blind from birth, hearing and speech to a deafmute, any more than He could have straightened a cripple's legs by a word, or have cleansed a leper instantaneously. Simple folk or enthusiasts may believe in such derogations from nature's laws on the evidence of pious legends ; the discriminating insist that one such fact shall be shown, and Renan is confident that no unbeliever shall ever witness the like.

[1] Renan. *Les Apôtres.* Eng. trans. Introduction, pp. 25-26.

112. But unbelievers have witnessed such things, cures which are as amazing as any recorded in the annals of Catholicism. We ask leave to mention a few.[1] Afterwards we shall state the conclusions which may be drawn from the facts.

On February 16th, 1867, Pierre de Rudder of Jabbecke (Western Flanders), a wood-cutter in the service of Viscount de Bus had his left leg crushed by a tree. Dr. Affenaer of Oudenbourg found that both bones of the leg, the tibia and fibula were broken a little below the knee. After a few weeks' treatment things had only become worse. The fragments of bone deprived of their periosteum, were swimming in matter, and another large and purulent ulceration had formed at the back of the foot. Eight years later, De Rudder's leg was still as bad despite the many doctors who had treated it. Dr. Affenaer had taken away a piece of fractured bone which had got lodged in the tissues. At the bottom of the open wound could be seen the two ends of the broken bones about an inch apart. "The lower part of the leg could be turned in any direction. The heel could be lifted so as practically to fold the leg in half. The foot could be twisted until the heel was in front and the toes at the back."[2] The only remedy was amputation, and De Rudder refused to consent to this. It was in this wretched condition that the poor man, leaning on crutches, and helped by his wife, took more than two hours to go the one and a half miles to the station on April 7th, 1875. He had set out on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Lourdes at Oostacker.

Despairing of being cured by human means, he went to ask Our Lady to enable him to provide for his wife and children. While praying, seated on a bench before the statue of the Blessed Virgin, he felt

[1] We take them from the work of Mr. Bertrin, *Histoire critique des événements de Lourdes, Apparitions et guérisons.* 19e mille. Paris, 1908.

[2] Deposition of Dr. Van Hoestenberghe of Stalhille, *cf.* Bertrin. *op. cit.* p. 244. Eng. translation, p. 167, London, 1908.

upset, shaken, agitated and quite outside himself. He rose up without any assistance, passed through the ranks of pilgrims, and knelt down before the statue. "Suddenly his presence of mind returned, and he realized that he had walked and was on his knees. 'I on my knees!' he cried. 'Where am I? O my God!' He was cured. There remained only a cicatrice in proof of his disease, and he was able to work as he had desired during the three and twenty years that elapsed after his cure.[1]

113. On August 20th, 1892, a young girl whose face was completely hidden beneath a black veil, was taken from the train at Lourdes. Her name was Marie Lemarchand. She was eighteen years of age, was the eldest daughter of a large and impoverished family, and had come to ask Our Lady of Lourdes to cure the horrible malady which afflicted and disfigured her. Zola travelled in the same train and has described her under the name of Elise Rouquet: "From underneath the fichu," he says, "a hoarse voice growled . . . The head looked hideously like a monster, with its rough hair and round staring eyes. The cartilage of the nose was almost eaten away, the mouth was drawn all on one side by the swollen condition of the upper lip. The whole was a frightfully distorted mass of matter and oozing blood."[2] Zola has described very minutely the terrible effects of tubercular lupus which forced the poor girl to cover her face. But the invalid had tubercular sores on her legs, and "her lungs were tuberculous at both apices."

The following day, August 21st, at about four in the afternoon, Marie Lemarchand bathed for the first time in the miraculous water. She left the bath suddenly and completely cured. Every wound had

[1] De Rudder died of pneumonia in 1898, at the age of seventy-five not sixty-four as the English translation of Bertrin's volume gives. *Cf.* The whole case in this volume. *Cf.* Eng. trans. pp. 165-185: and the Enquiry in the Original; Appendices pp. 511-519. (Paris, 1908.)

[2] We take our translation from the English version of Bertrin's volume, p. 222.

healed instantaneously and was covered with new skin, its surface red, it is true, but which very soon took on the normal flesh colour. When she returned to Caen, she paid a visit to her physician, Dr. La Néelle. He wrote expressing his astonishment to a confrère in Paris: "I saw the invalid immediately on her return. I did not recognise her, so much was she changed. I saw a graceful young girl coming towards me instead of the mass of humanity with a horrible and monstrous face which I had seen ten days previously. The tuberculosis had also disappeared. The cure has lasted." [1]

So complete had her cure been, that, when M. Bertrin made enquiries thirteen years later, he received the following letter from her.

COUBERT, SEINE-ET-MARNE,
December 1st, 1905.

SIR,—The dreadful disease of which I was cured at Lourdes has never reappeared. I am housekeeper in a chateau. I have been married six years, have had four healthy children, and am expecting a fifth. This is what the Blessed Virgin has done for a poor invalid who was given up by the doctors and declared incurable, and was only expecting death.

I should like to say that you have been very well-informed about my terrible illness and sudden cure. What you say is the exact truth. I was cured instantaneously, not after several baths, but after one only.

When I went into the piscina, I was suffering cruelly from horrible sores, and I came out completely cured. I felt quite well. I immediately took off the bandages which were on my face and on my leg there was nothing there. I could pass my hands over the places without feeling any pain. The suppuration had ceased suddenly. How joyfully and gratefully I went to the Grotto with my dear mother, who had been witness of my sufferings and of my cure! *I had not walked for three and a half years.*

[1] *Cf.* the whole letter Bertrin. Eng. trans., pp. 231-232.

I am infinitely grateful to the Blessed Virgin, who changed me so suddenly, and from the bottom of my heart I say glory and thanksgiving to Our Lady of Lourdes!

I am, etc.,

Marie Authier (*née* Marie Lemarchand).[1]

Before we proceed to the discussion of the miraculous, we shall give another case.

114. "On 17th December, 1899, Gabriel Gargam, who was a travelling Post-office clerk, took the express from Bordeaux to Paris at half-past ten in the evening. The carriage, in which he travelled with three companions, was the last but one in the train." Not far from Angoulême, the train stopped dead, and the engine could not be got to move. A corner which had just been passed prevented the rear-lights from being perceived. "Hardly had we stopped," relates Gargam, "when we heard a dull rumbling sound from behind us. It was the express which had left Bordeaux ten minutes after us, and which was now catching us up at the rate of fifty miles an hour. We had about two seconds to realise our horrible danger, when. . . . Then I discovered nothing more."

The carriage was smashed to pieces. Gargam had fallen 55 feet away in the snow, where he remained unconscious and almost buried until seven in the morning.

He was picked up and brought to the hospital at Angoulême, helpless, unconscious, his collar-bone fractured, and wounds all over his head and legs. "The fracture and the wounds healed fairly quickly, but the terrible shock of the accident had caused disastrous internal disorders. He was paralysed from the waist downwards, and it was almost impossible for him to take nourishment." During the first thirteen days the wounded man could only suck a few slices of an orange; on 1st January, 1900, he

[1] Bertrin, Eng. trans., pp. 232-233, note.

was able to eat an egg, but this improvement did not last long.

Twenty months later, when the invalid came to Lourdes, he had for a long time previously been fed by means of a tube, but on account of the terrible suffering it caused him, it could only be used once in twenty-four hours. He weighed but 78 lbs., the thigh just above the knee was only 26 centimetres (10 1-5 inches) in circumference. The paralysis had become worse, and gangrene had attacked his feet. The civil courts at Angoulême,[1] which had ordered the Orleans Railway Company to pay an annual pension of 6,000 francs, and an indemnity of 60,000 to Gargam, based their decision upon the fact that he was "a perfect wreck of humanity, with only his intelligence left unimpaired."

His intelligence retained sufficient faith to make Gargam consent at his mother's request, to confess his sins and receive Holy Communion; but he did not believe in the Lourdes miracles, and only consented to go out of consideration for his broken-hearted mother.

It was in these conditions of soul and body that he lay on his stretcher during the procession of the Blessed Sacrament, on 20th August, at about four in the afternoon. He had prayed and bathed in the piscina that morning, but without any effect. "The fatigue of the journey and the emotions of the day had used up all his strength." At the moment when the procession drew near he lost consciousness, and the people thought he was dead. Some wished to carry him away but his own people objected.

We shall let an unbeliever, who, from the beginning of the journey had carefully observed Gargam, and who was quite close to him at this moment, relate what occurred.

"The Blessed Sacrament is presented to each sick person; and as my sick friend waited his turn

[1] Judgment given 20th February 1901, which was confirmed, and the indemnity increased by the Bordeaux Court of Appeal. 2nd July 1901. *Cf.* Bertrin. French Ed. Appendice, pp. 546-549.

I looked at him again. When the priest turned the Blessed Sacrament in his direction he suddenly got up, and cried out, "I am cured!" The general excitement was tremendous. He was obliged to return to his stretcher because he was not dressed.

Directly afterwards they took him to the Medical Office. There, thanks to the card which M. de Beauchamp so kindly presented for me, I was able to follow him, and I could ascertain for myself, as did the doctors, that there had existed some sores on M. Gargam's body, especially on his feet, and that these sores had all the recent marks of healing."[1]

Gargam arrived on his stretcher at the Medical Office where sixty doctors were present. He got up from it looking like a ghost, but as he was barefoot and in his dressing-gown, he was taken to the hospital. That night he ate soup, oysters, the wing of a chicken, and a bunch of grapes. When he had seen those who came to visit him as late as ten o'clock, he went to sleep and slept well until the next morning, when he dressed in a new suit of clothes, and walked as well as anyone.

Six years later, M. Bertrin met him at Lourdes where he was looking after the sick. He was in perfect health, and retained only a slight reminder of his sufferings "in a certain weakness of the back at a spot where it is supposed that a vertebra was pressing on the medulla."[2]

115. We could give many other cases, but it would be wearisome if not impossible to mention them all. M. Bertrin, to whose volume we refer our readers for fuller details, has drawn up statistics of the wonderful cures concerning which he was able to obtain exact information, those especially which are recorded in the *Annales de Lourdes*, and in the register of the Medical Office which was established

[1] Report sent to the *Courier de la Vienne et des Deux-Sèvres*, August 26 and 27, 1901, over the signature of a Radical Councillor of the Midlands, who still remained an unbeliever after the miracle he had witnessed. *Cf.* Bertrin, *op. cit., Eng. trans.*, pp. 274-276.

[2] Bertrin, *op. cit.*, Eng. trans., p. 280.

in 1882 to record the evidence of the witnesses. These statistics show that, from 1858 to 1904, the number of cures was 3,353, including 301 cures of Pulmonary tuberculosis, 66 cures of Potts disease, 15 of Tubercular lupus, 48 cures of blindness, 28 of deafness, 36 cures of various skin diseases, 128 cures of diseases of the spinal cord, 104 cures of Tumours, and only 265 cures of Nervous diseases.[1]

116. We do not say that the 3,353 cures mentioned by M. Bertrin, are miracles in the strict meaning of the term which we shall shortly explain. But they are practically all of them certified by medical authority, and many of the cases are so notoriously authentic that, at the present time it is impossible to deny that things occur at Lourdes for which no scientific explanation can be given. And so these occurrences are no longer denied. Zola, who did not hesitate to tell lies in his endeavour to suppress or minimize the marvels he witnessed, was compelled to admit that faith obtained what medical suggestion could not accomplish.[2]

The cases are too public, there are too many witnesses, to permit of any doubt, and both Protestant and sceptical doctors have seen and testified to them. The "secret force" to which miracles of old were attributed has not, therefore, disappeared,

[1] *Cf.* Bertrin, Eng. trans., Appendix IV., pp. 293-296. "The Medical Registration Office alone registers annually from 100 to 200 cases and even as many as 263." (*Ibid.*, p. 91.)

[2] Zola, who had solemnly promised that he would tell the truth about Lourdes, gives an account of two miraculous cures he witnessed, *viz.*, that of Marie Lemarchand, under the name of Elise Rouguet, and that of Marie Lebranchu, under the name of La Grivotte. He knew well all that had happened, for he had assisted at two examinations held in the Medical Office, and made no protest. This, however, did not prevent him from inventing "*two days use of cold water lotions*, for the cure of lupus which he was fully aware had been cured instantaneously; and of making *La Grivotte who he knew was in good health, have a relapse and die*. Is the term "liar" too severe in such a case? *Cf.* Bertrin *op. cit.*, Eng. trans., pp. 225-244. [M. Bertrin gives in a footnote (French Edition, p. 346), the following statements made by La Grivotte: "In 1896, Zola made a proposal to her, that she should go and live in *some out-of-the-way place in Belgium*, assuring her that she should want for nothing, and as a proof of his intentions, he offered her a roll of bank-notes." Needless to say the money and the offer were indignantly rejected." Translator.]

but is more intense and more active than ever. The attempt was made to eliminate all records of the miraculous from the Scriptures and the history of Catholicism, on the grounds that it would have been impossible for thoroughly known natural laws to have been modified to such an extent, and that the Jews, in the face of such wonders would have been converted and would not have crucified the thaumaturgus. But the cases at Lourdes are not in greater agreement with the well-known laws of nature, while as was the case with miracles of Jesus, and those of all ages, they are a sign of contradiction; they work the conversion of some sceptics, but are an occasion of obstinacy for others. It is not permissible, therefore, to eliminate wholesale the wonders we read of in the chronicles of the past. The evidence of those who testify to them must be weighed, and judged in the light of the principles of criticism, which, while purely historical, are at the same time equally free from the fear and the love of the marvellous. Discriminating criticism demands that great allowances shall be made for the embellishments of the legend, and the divergencies in the really historical presentment of a miraculous fact; but it also demands that the laws of history shall not be set aside by refusing to accept evidence which possesses every guarantee of authenticity and veracity, merely because it testifies to the miraculous. The marvellous occurrences which are thus guaranteed are very numerous as may be learned even from the later volumes of the Bollandists, in which hagiographic narratives have been fearlessly examined in the light of the most trenchant criticism.

117. M. Guignebert, then, is more accurate than he thought when he states that miracles as great as those of Lourdes have been witnessed at Bétharam, near Lourdes, and "in a hundred other places;" but he is in error when he continues that this phenomenon "occurs wherever an exalted hope keeps all the reactionary forces of the human machine completely

strained."[1] Are these reactionary forces less amongst Protestants than amongst Catholics? How then, does it come to pass that, with the purpose at least of preventing simple souls from being imposed upon, Protestantism has never refuted and does not dream of refuting the charge made against it by Catholicism, that it cannot work miracles? M. Guignebert may say that: "Protestantism, which may lay equal claim with Catholicism to the benefits of Biblical miracles, might also reap as large a harvest of them as Catholicism does in our own days, if it considered it apposite."[2] Such a gratuitous assertion is a poor attempt to blink the truth, and reminds one of the fox and the grapes: "They are too green," said the fox, "and fit only for knaves."[3]

118. It would be certainly a matter for surprise that pagan beliefs should have been better able "to keep the reactionary forces of the human machine completely strained" than those of Protestant Christianity: yet it is to the ex-voto offerings in the temples of Esculapius, Apollo, Isis and Tanit that we are bidden, if we would find the equivalent of the Lourdes miracles. The mention of pagan ex-voto offerings need not offend us: it reminds us that always and everywhere, in paganism as in Catholicism, and, we will say as in Protestantism and the Schismatical Churches, religious souls have thought and still think, that the Lord of the Universe is not the slave of the brute forces He rules, and that the determination of

[1] *Mod. et trad.*, p. 65.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] "Knaves" would be too mild a term to apply to Catholics if they deserved the odious insinuation which is conveyed in the following passage: "Superstition of the most flagrant and deliberate kind, provided it is accepted by the ignorant, the enlightened, and the despairing sick as a divine manifestation, will certainly produce miracles as astounding as those in which Lourdes takes such pride." If M. Guignebert believes that the occurrences which have taken place openly and publicly at Lourdes during the past fifty years are "superstition," let him say so frankly. But if, knowing how absurd it would be to accuse either the sceptics or the French judicial authorities of colossal simplicity, when they have not been able to convict anyone of this "flagrant superstition" for fifty years, he tries to insinuate what he dare not openly assert, the polemical procedure is not only malicious but dishonest.

physical causes is neither so absolute nor so unbending that God, when He is petitioned in prayer cannot modify the evolution of phenomena in a way that is favourable to the suppliant who fears they will overwhelm him. The sentiment which urges the religious man who is in danger, to call upon God's assistance is a legitimate sentiment, and the prayers it inspires are efficacious not only amongst Catholics, but it may be, for all who are in good faith and who cry with confidence to God in their misery and distress. Protestants pray for their sick, and they do not always pray in vain; may not the prayers of some pagans who were in good faith have also been heard? Perhaps. But all the temporal favours obtained in this manner, even when those who have obtained them, whether they are Catholics or not, feel constrained to give public testimony to them by means of ex-voto offerings, must not be confused with what we call miracles. When divine intervention is not manifested with sufficient clearness as to be perceived with certainty, the believer may give thanks, but he may not say a miracle has been worked. The miracle exists only when the effect is in manifest disproportion with known or supposed natural antecedents, and in this respect, the miracles of Catholicism challenge all comparison with the supposed miracles of any and every other religion.

119. One must discount indeed the ignorance of those who know nothing of Lourdes, or Esculapius, to dare to compare the miracles of the Catholic shrine with the cures asked for in the pagan temple. The temples of Esculapius for the most part were served by bodies of priest-physicians.[1]

[1] M. Paul Girard, in his study on the *Asklepieion d'Athénes* is of opinion that the priest in charge and his chief assistant were not always physicians. But the strongest reason put forward by him does not appear to us to be convincing: "The supposition that there was always a physician amongst the attendants of Asclepios seems to be contrary to the very principle of the Asklepieion." We do not see any such opposition. The intervention of the priest-physician who explained the dream and took care of the sick, who sometimes made a long stay at the Asklepieion, did not at all prevent these sick people from placing their trust in the heavenly power of the healing god, and of attributing their cure to him,

The sick not only offered sacrifice to the god and slept in his temple, they had to undergo a course of treatment, and to use remedies which were chosen, or at least suggested, and always applied by these priest-physicians.[1]

Did the results surpass those which might be normally looked for from medical treatment that received powerful assistance from the trust inspired by religious sentiment? We should be extremely obliged if anyone could point to even one of these cases which appeared to be really miraculous, and to which historical testimony of a serious nature could be given. It would raise a very interesting theological problem: Is it possible that the invocation of divine power addressed in good faith to a false representation of God, can sometimes bring about a miracle? So far, however, there has not been any occasion to raise the question, and, though we have searched the records of the past we have not discovered even one case which could serve the purpose. It is true that tablets were discovered amid the ruins of Epidaurus in 1883, which were composed by the

as the ex-voto offerings in temples where the priests were physicians testify. Cf. *L'Asklepieion d'Athénes,* Paris, 1882, C. II., p. 35.

[1] The sanctuaries of Esculapius, "were built a certain distance away from towns, in elevated and healthy localities, near limpid streams and surrounded by sacred trees whose fresh foliage was pleasant to the sight. They were served by priests who acted as interpreters of the god by practising as physicians....Medical science at first was the monopoly of priestly families, who transmitted from father to son the secrets which were hidden from the profane....Before the sick were allowed to consult the god in his sanctuary, they had to undergo a course of treatment, part of which was merely hygienic, such as fasting, baths, etc., while other practices, purificatory and sacrificial, were of a religious character. After this preparation they were admitted to the temple and passed the night there, lying either on the skin of the animal they had sacrificed or on beds which were placed near the statue of Asclepios; this was the incubation. There, in the silence and semi-darkness of the sanctuary in which they saw the tamed serpents gliding across the floor, and seemed to see the god beside them, their imagination came into play. The god appeared to them during their sleep, drew near them and pointed out remedies which should cure them. On the following day they told the priests what they had seen or heard, and they interpreted the visions and applied the remedies ordered by the god. Those who were cured hung ex-voto offerings in the temple, slung gold and silver into the sacred fountain, and had the maladies they suffered from, the remedies which cured them, and their own names inscribed on tablets." P. Decharme, *Mythologie de la Grèce antique,* Paris, 1886, C. XV., pp. 296-297.

priests of the place and which gave an account of some forty-two cures that would be miraculous if they were historical. But these tablets make mention only of cures that occurred long before they were recorded, and give no indication either chronological or historical which allowed, or would allow, of their examination. They are nothing more than pious records that were hung on the pillars of the porch that they might be read by clients and inspire them with confidence.[1]

This is what is held up as the equivalent of Lourdes where there are no priest-physicians, where prayer, the drinking of, and bathing in, cold water are the only remedies used for every disease, and where the most wonderful cures are registered with such a wealth of historical and evidential detail as to allow any one, it matters not who he may be, to examine the records. No one, certainly, has any right to say that Lourdes and the Asklepieion are similar, or to state that: "Every religion that has desired to do so has found miracles at its service." We oppose to such an arbitrary statement, the following proposition, without fear of denial and in the name of history alone: Every religion has recognized the right of suffering humanity to ask God's assistance in temporal necessity: but in no religion has the prayer of the afflicted been so miraculously efficacious as it has been since Jesus dwelt amongst us, and in the Church which He has founded.[2]

[1] A serious study on the cures of Esculapius may be found in the Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft of Pauly-Wissowa, Stuttgart, 1896. Art. Asklepios, par. IX. Die Sacrale Iatrik der Asklepieen, t. II., col. 1686-1690.

[2] M. Paul Girard in concluding his study on the Asklepieion, cites the miraculous cures which still occur in the Island of Tinos on the festival of the Panhagia (The Most Holy Virgin). He does not allege any precise facts, and does not attach great importance to these phenomena. We cannot quote any authentic miraculous cures amongst schismatics; but we are of opinion, nevertheless, that they may happen in answer to prayers which have nothing schismatical about them, either in the formulas, or the object of worship, or in the hearts of suppliants who have no notion whatever of schism. But such miracles, if indeed there are any, can only be rare; for Providence could not permit that any display of equal or greater exterior miraculous power, should keep

120. But, however unique may be the development of the miraculous to which Catholicism lays claim, what conclusion can we draw from it? In the judgment of one unbeliever, the miracle proves nothing: "Let us take the most absurd, the most improbable case: A man who has been beheaded, a martyr, if you will, according to cephalophorus legends, picks up his head and walks off, carrying it in his arms. A phenomenon of this kind will certainly come as a surprise to the hardened unbeliever, but will it furnish him with any inkling of a dogmatic truth? I doubt it. When his amazement has passed, the man will say complacently: "In certain circumstances as yet inexplicable, and under the influence of certain causes which, as yet, are unknown, a man who has been beheaded, may pick up his head and walk."[1]

It is an everyday truth, proved by experience, that the most startling miracle does not in point of fact suffice to convince a hardened sceptic of the truth of revelation. In the so-called credulous times in which Our Lord lived, there were many stubborn sceptics who attributed the miracles of Jesus, if not to forces that were unknown, certainly to Beelzebub, a proceeding which dispensed them equally well from believing in Our Lord's teaching. But it would be going too far to imagine that the miracles did not give some idea of revealed truth to the sceptic however hardened. The obstinacy with which unbelief strives as far as it can to deny miracles, makes us suspect, and rightly, that its haughty assurance when confronted with miracles which are undeniable, is only a trick to hide some unacknowledged anxiety, and we hope to show that many of these occurrences, those especially which we have mentioned, bear such evident testimony in favour of Catholicism, as to urge the unbeliever who is cognisant of them, to weigh this testimony, lest, swayed by prejudice of which God

simple souls within, or draw them to, a Church which, as we know, no longer preserves the fulness of Catholic truth and vitality.

[1] Guignebert, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

alone can judge the culpability or innocence, he should no longer possess the normal power of criticising supernatural phenomena in a sane manner.

When confronted with a case like De Rudder's, where the fractured and disjointed bones were knit together instantaneously in a purulent sore which was as instantaneously healed; or with a case as Marie Lemarchand's of a hideous lupus and internal tuberculosis, which suddenly disappeared: of an exhausted girl with the face of a monster who was transformed into a graceful, healthy girl as soon as the Lourdes water touched her; or with the case of a dying man afflicted with gangrene, who, after twenty months of agony rose up at once in the full possession of normal health, as happened to Gabriel Gargam, the stubborn sceptic, shaken for a moment, soon regains his self-possession and says: *An unknown natural cause.* He has no more right to make such an assertion than the Pharisees had to cry: *Beelzebub!*

121. On the other hand, believers have no right to assert that in these occurrences there is the supernatural intervention of divine activity, simply because there is a disproportion between the effect produced, and its known, or imaginable natural antecedents. It does not follow that, because all the known or imaginable natural antecedents of a phenomenon which appears to be miraculous, are incapable of producing such a result, the result may not be attributed to some mysterious natural force whose activities have hitherto escaped investigation. This hypothesis, however, is not allowed in the case of an unprejudiced thinker, once he comes to consider that, in the three occurrences already recorded, and in hundreds of other cases to which we have referred, not only is there always an absence of known or imaginable natural causes which could account for the miraculous occurrences, but there is the quite unmistakable appeal to Divine power on the part of the person who is cured or the person who works the cure. How can

all influence be denied to this appeal, since without it,[1] this striking disproportion between natural antecedents and the marvellous effect is never found; while in miracles the most diverse, wrought for the benefit of any subject, or of any afflicted person whatsoever, in ancient times as well as in our own day, we inevitably find that the unchanging and constant antecedent of divine activity is affirmed? It seems to us that, having made this discovery, the man who is accustomed to the process of induction, must conclude in favour of the efficacy of this appeal to God, which alone is found to be the same always, with antecedent and consequent disproportion, amidst the indefinite variability of all the other elements of the miraculous phenomenon.[2]

Let it not be said that this appeal to divine power has the force of suggestion, as a religious emotion "which keeps the reactionary forces of the human machine completely strained." The hypothesis would have some appearance of probability, if the results obtained were of the kind obtained by suggestion, if they were proportionate to the religious emotionalism of the person cured, or if, at least, they were not obtained when this emotion was wanting. But none of these conditions are verified by facts.

If we are to believe the greatest authority amongst contemporary "suggesters," Dr. Bernheim,

[1] *Without prayer, or at least without intimation of divine intervention being affirmed by the thaumaturgus or by the circumstances of the wonders.*

We do not take into account the marvels, whether true or false, accomplished by magic in the name of the spirits, or the seemingly wonderful occurrences of a similar kind, which, in the lives of the saints, may have been specially caused by God. Pascal's dictum, that: "Doctrine attests the truth of miracles," applies to these marvels of a lower order, for it is not always easy to discover by the mere examination of occurrences of this kind and of their immediate circumstances, whether they are due to trickery, natural occurrences, the devil or God. The phenomena of ecstasy, raptures, apparitions, second sight, knowledge of secrets or of things at a distance, cures which may be attributed to nervous excitement, etc., appertain to this category.

[2] *Cf.* The article of l'Abbé Bros., *Comment constater le Miracle,* in the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne,* Juin, 1906; and the review in the *Revue Thomiste,* November, 1906. For a more profound study of this question cf. note on Miracles in *Crédibilité et Apologetique,* by Père Gardeil, O. P. Appendix.

Head of the School of Nancy, medical suggestion, after a lengthy period of skilful treatment, may bring about the cure of nervous diseases, functional troubles, which are not deeply seated, provided the organs are still uninjured; but it cannot repair injured organs, torn, or decayed tissues, or broken bones.[1]

Miraculous power produces these effects instantaneously, and other wonders as well: and the effects produced are in no way proportionate to the religious emotion of the subject. While a great number of women, as pious and believing as they are neurotic, have come to Lourdes with the conviction that they will be cured, and have gone home again, more resigned perhaps, but not suffering any less, a sceptic like Gargam, who did not believe at all in miracles, was snatched from the very corruption of the grave which had already seized upon him. Furthermore, the cases in ancient and modern times, in which religious emotion had no part, are numerous. Jesus, it is true, insists that those who called upon Him, should believe; but it was not as an emotional agent that this belief cured the Centurion's son or raised from death the daughter of Jairus, or the son of the widow of Naim. Nor was it the suggestion of religious emotionalism that cured George Lemesle, aged two years and seven months of infantile paralysis (1897); Fernand Balin, aged two years and six months, of a crooked knee (1895); Yvonne Aumaitre, whom the doctor, her father, plunged into the miraculous water in spite of her cries, and was taken out cured of a double club-foot, at the age of twenty-three months (1896); or Louise Lescuyer of Grièges, a sufferer from hip-disease, who returned home from a pilgrimage to Lourdes as ill as when she had set out, and who was cured during her sleep the night after she returned.[2]

Neither can the miraculous cures be attributed to the physiological reaction produced by religious

[1] Bernheim, *Hypnotisme, Suggestion, Psychothérapie*, Paris, 1903. 2e Edition, pp. 337-342.

[2] Bertrin, *op. cit.*, Eng. trans., pp. 142-144.

emotionalism any more than they can be attributed to the cold water and the atmosphere of the crowd, which, hygienic at Lourdes, would be prejudicial in other places. It is evident, moreover, that the miraculous agent possesses none of the characteristics of a natural force. The longest hidden natural forces which it has taken human science centuries to discover, however various they may be in some respects have this much in common, that they are all more or less fixed, produce the same effects under the same circumstances, a characteristic which helps towards their sufficiently speedy discovery and analysis as soon as some lucky chance has made an attentive observer begin to surmise the secret. Their mysterious influence does not long cause astonishment. As soon as it is conjectured it is followed up, taken possession of, and adapted, as far as possible, to the service of man. It has been thus with explosives, steam, electricity, magnetism; and it shall be so with every unknown natural force which the future may yet reveal. The miraculous agent, on the other hand, manifests itself as possessed of all the qualities of a free cause, whose conditions of activity no one can even approximately determine, though there have not been wanting occasions to observe them during the twenty centuries and more in which it has made itself manifest. So thoroughly convinced are sceptics even of this peculiarity, that they have not attempted to set up an observation office either at Lourdes or elsewhere, which would enable them to study and determine the conditions of the miracle. Prayer and holiness of life, which are the best means of obtaining the favour, obtain it very rarely, and never with assurance of success, a fact, by the way, which is unfavourable to the natural and subjective influence of religious suggestion.

What are we to think of this unknown agent? No power of the organism can escape its marvellous influence, yet it cannot be compelled to intervene. It responds to prayer, and to the invocation

of the name of God, but as a Master Who grants when He pleases, never as a servant who obeys, and with the evident purpose of limiting this miraculous activity to exceptional cases. Are we not obliged then, to attribute to it the characteristics of a free, intelligent cause which uphold the laws of nature, yet not in so strict a sense as to preclude its right to manifest by its extraordinary modes of action, the supreme mastery, the continual activity it possesses at all times over created things, and which urges us to adore it as God the Creator? And when we desire to consider under one unique concept, all the facts we have analysed in terming them miracles, it seems very difficult to escape from the idea of a miracle which does not include more or less explicitly the elements of the following definition.

122. *The miracle is a sensible phenomenon, which because of its evident disproportion with its known or imaginable natural antecedents and the religious circumstances in which it is effected, is legitimately attributed to a divine activity, superior, as regards its effects, to the ordinary concurrence which is given by the First Cause to every act of created causes.*

123. Acceptance of this idea of a miracle, however, inevitably makes for an acknowledgment of the Catholic magisterium as divine teaching. It is quite true that some miracles may not possess any well defined apologetic signification, and that they are chiefly the reply on the part of God's goodness to man's supplication. But it appears exceedingly difficult that the society, in which the gift of miracles promised by Jesus to His Church is shown forth in such an incomparably brilliant manner, should not be the Church which Jesus chose as His only bride; and it is impossible to deny, to the miracles of Lourdes particularly, the value of a sign which the circumstances in which they occurred does not permit us to refuse to them.

In 1854, Pius IX, exercising his Pontifical authority for the first time in a manner unknown in past ages, solemnly defined a dogma which the ancient Church implicitly admitted but had not explicitly affirmed, the Immaculate Conception. This definition was, and still remains, a stumbling-block to all the Separated Churches. Even amongst Catholics there were many who only accepted it with aversion. Was it not abuse of power? Did the Holy Ghost still abide with the Roman Church and her head? Less than four years afterwards, on the banks of the Gave, a wonderful apparition said in reply to the question of a shepherdess: "I am the Immaculate Conception." She insisted that a Church should be built in honour of this marvellous privilege, and it is at the invocation of God through the intercession of the Immaculate Virgin, that nearly all the miracles of the nineteenth century took place, miracles, which in every age have been the sign of God's predilection for the Catholic Church, yet never with such solemn effect as now. Can we possibly conceive of a God, intelligent and free, being lavish of marvels in such circumstance which shall make for the diffusion and confirmation of the worship of untruth amongst peoples? Can we possibly doubt that God has given His approval to the Pontiff's definition? Extrinsecism if you will, but Extrinsecism bound up in such a manner with our deepest and most vital sentiment of divine truth, and divine providence, that we cannot escape its conclusions, except by denying miracles as we have defined them, or at least by doubting their supernatural reality.

124. To deny miracles by pretending to lower them, with an assurance that is either foolishness or disloyalty, to the level of phenomena of the natural order, is an untenable solution. Common enough, unhappily, is the position of those, who, while they loyally admit the insufficiency of known or supposed natural forces to explain miraculous phenomena, and the insistence with which supernatural causality

appears to be asserted, hold, nevertheless to the dictum of Montaigne: "What do I know?" We have a typical example in the unbeliever of whom we have already spoken as a witness of Gargam's cure. To everyone who was desirous of knowing what he thought of the cure, he gave the answer which is characteristic of a state of mind only too common amongst the better class of sceptics: "I repeat that I do not believe in miracles, but I can no longer assert the contrary." [1]

Scepticism which is too common, saddening to serious souls, of little moment for the frivolous, but which were mere argument, will never make those relinquish who are imbued with the prejudices of rationalism, in that the strongest natural reasons cannot prevail over their unwillingness to admit the mystery that is in every miracle as in all that is supernatural. They will relinquish it only when they believe, and faith is not by any means only a rational conclusion, but the free and supernatural assent of a heart and an intelligence in which divine grace has conquered the egotism and dispelled the darkness. We shall explain this in concluding our study with an analysis of the Act of faith.

[1] *Art. cit.* in the *Courrier de la Vienne.*

CHAPTER XIII.

The Act of Faith.

125.—Integral Apologetics. The two facts, internal and external. 126.—Two schools of Apologetics. 127.—The internal fact according to theology and experience. 128.—Tendencies which show the religious instinct of humanity. 129.—Peculiar attractiveness of Catholicism. 130.—The antipathy it occasions. 131.—Some types of various states of soul. Intuitive faith. 132. —Unsettled thinkers. 133.—Supported by the internal fact. 134. —Lost through intellectual pride. 135.—Twofold revolt of senses and intelligence. 136.—The crises of youth. 137.—The unbeliever satisfied. 138.—Trials, and the first steps to regain faith. 139.—The proofs for the existence of God. 140.—Examination and recapitulation of the motives of belief. 141. —Premature conversion. 142.—Conversion leading to the Act of Faith.

125. "There are two facts to verify, one within you, the other without; each seeks the other that it may unite with the other, and you yourself are the witness to these two facts." These words were addressed by Cardinal Dechamps to a sceptic he desired to convert,[1] and Père Gratry said of the Cardinal: "He touched the real basis of apologetics: the harmonisation of two facts, internal and external: the idea is most important and of great weight."[2] Such indeed, is the purpose of all integral apologetics.

To awaken the conscience to its need of God, in Whom alone we can find true and perfect happiness, a need which exists in every soul, even in that of the

[1] We have taken the passage from M. Mallet, who refers to it as the epigraph of one of the chief apologetical works of Cardinal Dechamps. *L'oeuvre du Cardinal Dechamps et la méthode d'Apologétique,* in the *Annales de philosophie Chrétienne.* Oct. 1905, p. 70.

[2] *Ibid,* p. 71. For an analysis of the Act of Faith, *cf.,* M. Mallet's study on *L'unité complexe de l'acte de foi. Méprises et éclaircissements* in the *Revue du Clergé Francais.* Feb, 1st, 1908.

unbeliever, and which divine assistance insistently forces in upon us from time to time; to show on the other hand the duty incumbent upon us of accepting revelation if God reveals Himself to us; and, finally, to show that in point of fact this obligation exists with regard to Catholic dogma and ethics, the revelation of which is manifested with certainty by the motives of credibility, this is the mission of the Apologist. The Act of Faith is made only when man is convinced at last that, between his interior desire, which is God's call, and the exterior demands of revelation which is God's gift, he must create that harmony by which the unity of human life, completely docile to its divine tendency, is effected, and without which no man can enjoy peace on earth or a well-founded hope of a happy eternity.

The best established motives of credibility will never persuade him who does not yet, or does not any longer, experience the need of God, and who is not prepared to respond to the obligation incumbent upon him of accepting the words of eternal life. This does not by any means imply that these possess no objective value. They are sufficient to convince the sceptic that he is bound to make the Act of Faith. If they do not beget this conviction, the reason is that prejudice will not permit the recognition of their real value. If on the other hand, they have no value whatever, they will prove nothing even to him who thirsts for supernatural truth; for, however strong man's desire for, however imperious his need of, revealed truth, his demand for rational guarantees is not less strong, nor is his desire to verify the divine authenticity of the revelation held out to him less imperious.

126. Is it possible, however, that the motives of credibility which are objectively adequate, should be of value or not according to the will of the person to whom they are propounded? And does it not force us to suspect their worth if their efficacy is subordinate to certain moral dispositions? It was chiefly

through fear of awakening or strengthening these suspicions that the classic apologists of the last century only hinted at the internal fact, and made use of it only in private instructions. It was misplaced timidity. On the other hand, have not those apologists who are more or less identified with the immanent school, shown an exaggerated confidence which is somewhat contemptuous of the external fact, in the consciousness of this interior yearning, which, understood in the definite sense of a need of Catholicism, or even a positive desire for revelation, is neither so general nor so pressing as some would have us believe.

We must not be taken as hypercritical. We incline rather to be grateful to, than to pronounce judgment upon, the adherents of the two schools of apologetics, for we have profited largely by their discussions: but having expressed our indebtedness, we proceed to investigate the problem.[1]

127. First of all, a sketch of this interior fact, as experience shows it, is necessary. We shall then show under what conditions it joins forces in the Act of faith with the exterior fact of Catholic revelation, and how it renders the motives of credibility efficacious, not by exaggerating their value, but by enabling the mind to perceive them and to accept their conclusions.

It is with deliberate purpose that we wish to describe the interior fact "as experience shows it," not as it could be shown by Catholic teaching. Theology teaches us that each human being is actually created for the beatific vision, and, consequently, that independently of faith, none can find that rest which the normal tendency of life makes for, or perfect happiness outside this promised vision.[2] The

[1] Our remarks do not refer to those Immanentists who have been so justly condemned by the Encyclical *Pascendi*, and whose doctrines are productive of more evil than good.

[2] The absolutely normal tendency is the full and entire adhesion to integral religious truth, or Catholicism. But peace may be found in the relatively normal tendency of a soul, which, living in good faith outside

desire for happiness, which, in the hypothetical state of pure nature would have been confined to the absolute desire of a good that was naturally possible,[1] has become the desire for perfect happiness by our being raised to the supernatural order, an efficacious desire, and strong purpose when the soul is in the state of grace, an inefficacious desire in the souls of sinners whom grace draws towards, but does not yet bring about, conversion. So shall it be as long as the gratuitous and supernatural possibility of obtaining immediately enjoyment of God which is now held out to us, remains unfulfilled. This desire would be torture to us, if through our own fault it should remain unfulfilled for eternity. These, however, are truths of faith upon which we may not build any argument in Apologetics.

The interior fact, such as experience of life shows it to be, is far more complex. There we find strong and undeniable yearnings of the human heart for Catholicism, but we also find decided aversion which rarely completely disappears. The yearning and aversion war with each other in as many ways as there are varied dispositions, whether natural or acquired, of education, of the social environment of each individual, and of the graces he has received. Yet, amid this diversity of which the Apologist must take account, there are common traits which he must notice, and of which he should make use to determine the psychological state, the interior and normal fact,

Catholicism, clings with its whole heart to that portion of revealed truth which the religion it professes offers it. This peace will not be disturbed until the moment when Providence in calling this soul to the full truth, shall manifest that truth to it, and will not allow it to rest until the call has been obeyed.

[1] We could be happy even if the conditional desire, the mere wish for a good which we know is impossible, is not satisfied. Thus it is that children who die without baptism will not suffer because they do not enjoy the vision of God, of which they ma, dream, yet which they know was never a possibility for them. It is quite otherwise with the lost, who during life could have won this beatitude but neglected to do so. Cf. *Revue Thomiste*, Mars-Avril, 1905. *A quel bonheur sommes-nous destinés?* 2e Article; *Le Rapport de la nature et du surnaturel d'après les théologiens scolastiques du XIIIe au XVIIIe siècle*, in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*. Mars. 1 and 13, 1908.

in pointing out the way to those who have strayed from it.[1] His task is confined to this. Man does not convert his fellow man; he can only help him *to allow the truth to guide him* by the mysterious touch which alone is able to uplift the human being to the divine, and to lead the unbeliever on the road which has been shown him as the way to faith.

128. The needs of the human soul which find their satisfaction in the practice of religion, and in the practice of Catholicism particularly, are many.

There is no one who does not quickly realize his helplessness to assure himself the peaceful possession of those worldly goods which are most necessary for his happiness, and to protect his fortune, health, ambitions, interests and his life against rival forces which are frequently brutally inimical. This feeling of helplessness begets an ardent desire to meet with some superior power which he may call to his aid in case of extreme difficulty.

The man who reflects soon perceives the insufficiency of earthly pleasures also, the longing for which has all the deceptive charm of a mirage in the desert, but which leave behind them, each time they are enjoyed, if not weariness and disgust, certainly the self-same longing for better and fuller joy which to-morrow ever promises but never gives. For the anguish caused by the comprehensiveness of man's thought which overruns the narrow limits of his activity on every side there is no remedy except in the hope of discovering in another life that higher good for which we were created but which we shall never find on earth. It is this truth that St. Augustine has expressed in the well-known words: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, Lord, and our hearts are restless until they find their rest in Thee."

The righteous man, however disinterested he may be, suffers, and keenly too, not only from the

[1] On the value of Internal Apologetics, *Cf.* Pére de Poulpiquet, O. P., *l'Objet Intégral de l'Apologétique, Paris,* 1912, pp. 409-425.

injustices of fortune of which he believes he is the victim, but as greatly, nay even more, from the scandalous success of so many evil projects, by which, thanks to errors of opinion, the indifference or evil passions of the multitude or the knavery or violence of the wicked, the most sacred rights are trampled upon, and iniquity is flushed with the success it has achieved. This spectacle gives him a soul-thirst after justice which can only find its assuagement in the hope that human judgments shall be reversed and positions changed by One who is supremely just and powerful, and Who is able to assure the definite triumph of good over evil, of the just over the unjust.

The mistakes of frailty, from which the righteous may not escape, do not at once destroy this thirst after justice. So long as they have not corrupted the very heart of man, remorse begets a desire of better things, of penance which urges the soul not only to seek a means of appeasing the judge Whom it fears, but urges it still more to recover the justice which it loves, and the loss of which it so deeply regrets.

It is to these needs, of purification,[1] of justice, of happiness and of assistance, that religion offers fulfilment, through the intimate communication it seeks to establish between man and divine power considered as the great force of the universe, the source of all good and of all holiness. The universality and permanence of the religious sentiments, under the many forms it has taken on amongst peoples of widely different races and epochs, are sufficiently clear testimony to the strength and universality of the inclinations which have caused and which foster it. Very strong, too, are the sympathies of the human heart with that particular form of religion which is Catholicism.

[1] This desire of purification is not peculiar to Christianity but is to be found in many religions.

129. Amidst the cares, troubles and pettiness of daily life, man thirsts for the truth concerning such important yet difficult questions as his origin and purpose, which shall possess the highest guarantees. He desires a God who will take interest in him. He craves for consolation in his sufferings, help which will uphold him, and assist him in his needs; he longs for a hope and love which can fill his heart, a worship which is in keeping with his condition as an incarnate spirit and a social being. Catholicism satisfies every demand.

To all the great questions which engage the human mind, its articles of faith give answers which lay claim to divinely guaranteed infallibility, and assure to the Catholic thinker that tranquillity which he requires to study their consequences and to draw from them practical results. The Crucified and Risen Jesus it preaches, is very God, Who became one of us to save us, to show forth His goodness, and to give us such practical and life-giving teachings on life, suffering and death, that those who are thoroughly permeated with the spirit of Catholicism, find their joy in suffering and death.[1] The love it inspires is so strong that it upholds those whose natures seem to be the most impressionable, it protects them against the most dangerous allurements, and emboldens them to laugh at the most horrible forms of martyrdom. Yet this love is withal so gentle, that it frequently wins an heroic forgetfulness of injuries, and a wondrous devotedness in comforting another's misfortune. The grace of its repentance is so powerful that it can change, and in point of fact has changed times without number, miserable sinners into wonderful saints. The happiness it promises us is greater far than anything we could hope for. Its worship takes the whole man, senses and soul, and thus remains wor-

[1] Without, however, falling into the excesses of the foolish and cruel practices of certain kinds of Indian and Mussalman asceticism.

ship in spirit, without ever ceasing to be worship in truth, the real prayer adapted to the human being. Finally, its hierarchy embraces all mankind in a universal brotherhood such as scattered peoples could not dare to dream of, and sweetens, though it does not suppress, the natural, legitimate and necessary divisions of nationalities.

130. These are the characteristics of Catholicism which win us; yet we may not be silent regarding the aversion and revolt to which its demands give rise. Its ethical teaching is beautiful, but to some it appears hard, to others an impossibility; and in a sense it is so when the Catholic has not surrendered himself to Jesus Christ with that generous abandonment which alone makes the yoke of the Master sweet and light, by reason of the graces it confers.

If, however, Catholicism only proposed to govern the senses and the egotism of the heart, it would only appeal to noble and generous souls; but it also proposes to regulate thought, and for many lofty minds this is an intolerable burden. Theoretically, such a proposal does not easily justify itself. Without being still on the same intellectual level as primitive man, we are all of us convinced that we do not know everything about anything, and that every scientific and philosophical system is hedged around with mysteries. It would seem then, that we should joyfully accept every revelation which teaches us something, be it ever so little, of this higher world, knowledge of which is not a question of mere curiosity but a principle of practical orientation, since we are urged to prepare for our entrance therein. But the double need of ordered thought and independent search which is innate in us, and which rightly regulates our natural cognition, must be taken into account. Supernatural realities can only be very imperfectly expressed in terms and concepts taken from the natural order. However,

productive they may be, for vital activity, the practical consequences of dogmas like those of the Incarnation and the Eucharist, and their enunciation in propositions which, though not contradictory are nevertheless such that their full import escapes us, breaks the harmony of thought with which we wish to see first principles expressed without either disjointure or violence. Yet further, where the evidence is not such as compels us, the mind likes to construct its hypotheses in a way it understands, and to choose its masters as it pleases, if not always indeed, on account of their worth, at least on account of its own fancy, which is always some satisfaction. This freedom, however, it does not wholly enjoy where dogmas are concerned. Their definitions point out happily, but not always agreeably, the route from which the mind must not stray in its efforts to get a knowledge of supernatural facts. Accustomed to speak as experts on matters which appertain to the natural order from which we daily pluck new secrets, we must be satisfied to stammer and to become as docile children when supernatural truths are in question. This resignation costs the more, the more intense and more prolonged the intellectual labour which develops the needs opposed to it. There is not a theologian who has not felt this, and M. Le Roy only expresses in new, and not always very just language, a feeling that is already old when he describes more eloquently than accurately the opposition between Catholic dogma and modern thought.[1] The thinkers of old were aware of this opposition, and St. Paul, who knew what it was himself, and knew also what others felt with regard to it, did not attempt any extenuation of it when he wrote: "For the weapons of our (apostolic) warfare are not carnal; but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications (of unbelief) destroying counsels; and every height that exalteth itself

[1] *Dogme et Critique. Qu'est ce qu' un dogme?* pp. 1-13.

against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ; and having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled." [1]

In giving the earth to man, God left natural phenomena to his free investigation which faith would never oppose; but to use this same freedom with regard to revealed truths and the mysterious realities of the supernatural world would be a sacrilegious profanation. "The heavens are the heavens of Jhahve, the earth only has been given to the children of man." [2] These absolute demands of dogma, which are not to be found so peremptory in any religion as in the Catholic Church, together with those ethical teachings which nowhere else are so rigorous, heavily counterbalance the attractions of Catholicism, and from a purely natural point of view, one might say, successfully, and make it the most hated as well as the most winning form of religion, just as Jesus its Founder was, and still remains, the most hated and best loved of the children of Israel.

131. Never a matter of indifference to those who know it, Catholicism in varying degrees is loveable or hateful, according as the different dispositions of those who profess or attack it, draw near to, or turn away from it. It is impossible to point out all of these degrees, yet we wish to portray some states of soul which appear to be the chief types to which the infinitely diverse individualities may be referred.

Catholicism is wholly loveable to those privileged beings whom Catholic parentage, a happy disposition, and, still more, choice graces have accustomed to bear the yoke of the Lord from childhood. It is only at certain moments that they have experience of some revolt of the flesh or some trouble of

[1] 2 Cor. x. 4-6.

[2] Ps. cxv. 16, Hebrew text.

soul according as they are more or less exposed to the seductions of sensuality, or to the contradictions which the codified mystery of dogmas ever causes to the inquiring mind. These troubles, however, are but passing clouds in the calm atmosphere of such souls whom a full and fervent practice of the supernatural life ever keeps in the sunshine of God's influence. Such a life, the more powerful the longer and more habitually it has been practised, lessens the resistance of both mind and will to Catholic virtue and Catholic belief, while it imparts, if not a very explicit intellectual consciousness of their beneficent truth, at least a deep and lively appreciation of it. They may not be able to express their reasons for belief in logical terms, but they possess something which is better than any analytical exposition, the direct and practical intuition of their faith. Our apologetical treaties would have proved tiresome to St. John and Mary of Bethany, if, indeed, they would not have caused a smile. In the twentieth century, the Church of Jesus Christ includes many a John, many a Mary as she did in the first days: but I know not if there are many like Didymus.

132. We remarked that, intense intellectual application, and the habit of reflection, develop at the same time power of thought and its instincts of independence and unifying synthesis. It may, and it does, happen that, the hard struggles of intellectual progress, and the legitimate, yet somewhat intoxicating, joys which such progress brings, may make the believing thinker or critic forget that the greatest genius is but a child when he comes to deal with supernatural truths. He then finds that the limits in which the exposition of dogmas may move are too narrow, and that the formulas in which the Church expresses them are too meagre. He desires greater freedom, thinking he will find more light. But when a long and serious practice of Catholic life has imparted to him the experimental sense of divine

things such as we find in the Church, he clings to his Catholicism not less tenaciously than to his independence, for he knows full well that the separated vine-branch grows only to die quickly, and it is then that the cry is raised: "Oh! Church of Christ, make your mysteries human, enlarge their formulas, or give us at least the liberty to understand them as we please."

133. It is not uncommon for good Catholics, even priests who have devoted their lives to study, to experience in some degree these anxieties. When the sentiment of the weaknesses of the human mind in which, whatever their talent, they have their share, is lessened, they are strongly tempted to identify their case with that of impersonal reason, and to consider as error, contradiction or absurdity, whatever is opposed in Catholic teaching to their individual views,[1] oftentimes the temptation is but a trial in which, assisted by grace, they find a truer consciousness of man's inability to analyse the divine, and from which their faith comes forth purified and strengthened. At such a period, when the mind is anxious, it is difficult to appreciate the value of the motives for believing: reasons which appeal to the heart are often the best support of such anxious souls, and hence their leaning towards apologetics which chiefly rely on the internal fact.

134. Yet again such temptations result at times in disaster. The anguish caused by the contradiction of the moment destroys in the long run appreciation of the benefits of faith. The examination of the motives for belief is undertaken again, but with the object, as keen as it is unexpressed, of discovering

[1] The conflict may arise also from a mistake in regarding as obligatory Catholic teaching what is only a common opinion, and sometimes an erroneous opinion. The remedy is to be found in study, and in consulting solid theologians, not those who delight in accusing faith of scientific absurdities, forgetful that foolishness does not always absolve from the sin of presumption the writer whose ignorance upsets others, closes against them the gate of God's Kingdom, or drives them from the Church in lightly treating what they have not taken the trouble to understand.

flaws in them, a discovery that is easily made when the only exposition of them which is recognized is based, unfortunately, upon historical or scientific data that are out of date or dubious. From the defects of the only kind of apologetical argument which such a man possesses he infers that its conclusions are ill-founded. The dissatisfaction of the believer with regard to faith, his obligations, and the Church, increases day by day, as also his over-confidence in his own personal views, and thus he gradually draws nearer to the moment when he will sacrifice the benefits which are not given up without regret, and the want of which will be greater than he thinks, in satisfying the pseudo-obligation of being loyal to his convictions. But he has received too much from faith ever to be calmly persuaded that it is an error or a lie; hence the apostate believes that he is strictly bound to work unceasingly to justify his denials, in attacking the Church which he has loved too well to be able to withdraw from her without becoming her foe.

135. There are apostasies, then, whose sole cause is impatience with regard to the yoke of faith. They afford but little hope of return, but they are also of rare occurrence. Far more numerous are those which arise from the revolt of the senses and from personal interest against that self-denial demanded by Catholicism, before finding the justification of their apostacy in the revolt of the intelligence. Cases like these are specially frequent and easily accounted for in the crises of youth when so many go astray.

136. Between the ages of twelve and twenty-five, intellectual and moral life is characterized by an exuberance of spirits in which the development of the imagination and of the inclinations to which it gives rise make themselves felt by their tyranny over rational and voluntary inclinations, when they are

not controlled and guided by a strong moral and religious education. Reason, it is true, takes cognisance of its right to control and direct; but the desire to use it precedes only too often the experience and power of reflexion required to use it well. There is nothing which so greatly distresses a well-wisher of youth as the native expectation of dawning metaphysical convictions on the part of young students of philosophy. How astonished they are when they are told that in Aristotle's opinion no one could have any personal philosophical opinions before the age of thirty! Alas! except they are restrained by the true sentiment of self-diffidence which is the outcome of the grace of faith, and by a fervent practice of their religion, they are hopelessly condemned, by the peculiarities of their age as also by its short-comings, to know something of practical epicurianism, and (to allow themselves) to be led astray by the imaginative theories of materialism, particularly when they have both time and means at their disposal.

There is no need to enumerate the many seductions which exercise a corrupting influence over youth, and which make Catholic morality appear inhuman, while undervaluing the happiness it promises in comparison with the pleasures of the world. Dogma has no further hold upon a mind which conceives with difficulty realities it cannot even picture to itself. What are the motives for believing this dogma? Habit, education, family tradition? But if religion is worn out, or practised because it is commanded, there is all the greater reason for being done with it. These, certainly, are not the best dispositions in which to undertake a revision of the motives for belief, yet one day or other, the sarcasms of the impious or the restlessness of temptation puts them before even the least reflecting youth. It is empirical or mathematical proofs alone that appeal to the man who wants to disbelieve; any other testimony he refuses to accept. In a similar way his

desire to gratify some passion renders a man utterly deaf to the sincerest warnings against the moral or physical ruin to which he exposes himself. And again, many a mother whom pride in her only son has blinded, will not believe that he is corrupted until she has proof positive of the fact. Now, the demonstration of the divine authority of Catholic teaching is a resultant of moral proofs. A man who is so inclined may always find some pretext for challenging each proof taken separately. It is easier still to reject them when they are not properly grasped, as happens when a youth has been insufficiently instructed by those whose only method of training is to make him practise his religion in a routine manner, without helping him to grasp its spirit and without any attempt at supplying him with a serious apology for it. The child who, after his First Communion listens only to the seductive voice of passion, and hears only the insidious objections of unbelief, and to whom no friendly voice speaks authoritatively and with sympathy the words that will enlighten and assist him, will inevitably become irreligious unless a miracle of grace preserves him.

People are amazed at times, at the number of young men who lose their faith after having received a Catholic education. We do not share this argument, and we can only attribute to the marvellous influence of God's grace, the fact that so many young men still cling to their religious convictions under circumstances, which, naturally speaking, ought to prove fatal. The best way of seconding this work of grace and of assisting youth, is unquestionably to ensure to them, after a solid religious education, a rational practice of religion, and to initiate them by degrees, and by means of the apostolate of charity, into a knowledge of the miseries of actual life, of the help afforded by faith to bear those miseries, and of the joys of real Christian life and its devotedness. The integral Apologetics of *Action* are needed to keep

a hold upon youth, but Apologetics which are purely intellectual will not suffice to bring back the wanderers.

137. The man who is careless, who is intoxicated with pleasure, wealth, ambition, or with the idea of his own intellectual superiority, proves refractory to all apologetical teaching so long as he has not learned life's lesson, that is, so long as he has not experienced the insufficiency of all that life can give. It is useless to mention religion to the sceptic who is satisfied with things; it is only the occasion for fresh blasphemy. Such a man has only the deepest aversion for a religion which threatens to snatch from him his earthly gratifications, or to poison his pleasures by the perspective of eternal punishment, and for a dogma which ruthlessly reminds him that the intelligence of which he is so vain is not sufficient. It is not that he already possesses all the enjoyment he desires, all the certitude for which he is athirst—to-morrow he will possess these things: meanwhile, he only wishes to know and understand the reasons by means of which he may silence for a time that voice which tells him: Are you certain that there is no God? Is it a fact that you are not obliged to consider him?

138. However prosperous a life may be, sooner or later it has its days of trial and of reflexion. Each year leaves certain wounds behind it, and fills the heart with certain fears which put to flight the illusions of youth. To the early transports of pleasure succeed disgust and weariness, nay physical suffering, often times, and moral anguish, instead of greater enjoyment. Reason regretfully recognises that in place of being able to push onwards towards ever increasing certitude, the few facts which it regarded as well-established are but chimerical, and that it is powerless to answer the questions which have the greatest interest. And remembering these things, men ask: Is life worth living? There is no

sceptic who, one day or other, does not put the question which is fraught with such discouragement.

This is the hour best suited for the call of grace. The angel of good counsel holds out to the unbeliever who is more or less disgusted with the world, and often with himself, the promise of a life beyond, where he shall find the happiness he has vainly sought here on earth, and an earthly life that is worthier of him, more fruitful in good deeds, in peaceful joy, fuller too with certitude, with strengthening hope and love than is the deceptive existence, the emptiness of which he now experiences. This is the first movement of grace ; the showing forth of a divine good, and of happiness to be sought in man's submission to God.

What is there, however, in this divine good, this ethereal happiness of a life wholly devoted to a generous practice of goodness here on earth, and of an everlasting life which makes not the slightest appeal to the senses or imagination, that can possess any attraction for the man who has been taken up with—and perhaps for a lifetime—pleasures, or the pursuit of those goods which *do* appeal to the senses or the imagination ? It is of faith, and it is a matter of experience also, that sin does not utterly destroy in this life those aspirations of the human soul towards the ideal which are at the very roots of its being ; but how dim is the flame of this sacred fire when years of a worldly life have smothered it beneath the ashes of accumulated wickedness. The breath of trial is no longer sufficient to scatter these ashes ; nothing less than the burning breath of the Holy Ghost will stir the smouldering embers into flame, and urge the worldly sceptic to manifest some desire for that wholly spiritual, wholly divine, good which faith offers to all who will receive it. Under the influence of this new grace, the unbeliever begins to envy the happiness of those who believe, and to consider things from the standpoint of the supernatural he has so long despised, yet in which he may

nevertheless find that full and satisfying happiness he despaired of ever finding in this world, together with the answer to the riddle of life. If it were only true, he says to himself, and he begins, timidly to hope that it is true. But if it is true, this divine good must be loved, and loved in deed not in words only, while every sacrifice this love demands must be made. Yes : I would love. But again, such love demands that he must have hope, must acknowledge his weakness and insufficiency, must put his confidence in God, bend his knee, bow his head, and cry out to his Lord: Of myself I can do nothing, do Thou save me. Yes: If it were true I would hope, for such hope would be sweet indeed, and the sentiment of humility which it implies would not cost much after all. Have I not experienced my helplessness hundreds of times? But is it true? Hope necessitates belief, the assent to mysterious dogmas, to the announcement of divine facts, fruitful, indeed, in their practical consequences, but which reason understands not, and which it must accept without questioning on the faith of a teaching given in the name of a supernatural revelation, a thing which is itself a mystery. It is true that I am enveloped in mystery, but I like to be able to say when I am puzzled:—" I do not know," yet now I must say: " I believe "—in most improbable things, I must affirm what my reason, naturally speaking, is tempted to deny. It is hard; and yet experience shows that the truth may sometimes be improbable. I am not the criterion of truth. Is it so surprising that there should be entities ruled by laws other than those of the world of phenomena from which I ordinarily take my modes of thought? Even in considering this world, I am confronted with antinomies which, at times, make me distrust my own intelligence. And shall I, who am sceptical in regard to all else, have the assurance to reject beforehand the message of salvation held out to me in God's name? The least I can do is loyally to examine such a proposal. Is it

true, then, that the testimony of the Church gives guarantees to the believer which are proportionate to the demands she makes upon his confidence? Ah! if this were true![1]

The sceptic who thinks and speaks like this already possesses the predispositions required for examining the reasons for belief. He does not yet possess that confidence which only seeks to give itself, but he possesses the open mind and sincere will to give at least the same attention to the defence of, as to the attacks against Catholicism. If this desire remains to counteract all those of an inferior kind, including that of an over great independence, the mind, freed from its vehement inclination to disbelieve, will find it hard, as St. Augustine tells us, to struggle against the external fact, against those amazing signs which bear testimony of the divine origin of Catholic teaching. "Where is the soul desirous of eternity and impressed by the shortness of this present life, that can struggle against the light and sovereign power of this divine authority?"[2]

139. Recognition of this divine authority does not necessarily presuppose the rigorous, metaphysical demonstration of the existence of God. Such proof exists, but its full and rigorous exposition demands such critical knowledge at the present day as excludes it from a brief apologetical treatise, in that it is practicable only for those who are professedly philosophers. But this does not by any means imply that we are reduced to the necessity of postulating

[1] We have taken the analysis of these first movements towards a return to belief from the text of St. Thomas: *Cum alicui proponuntur aeterna bona, primo vult ea, secundo vult eis inhaerere per amorem, tertio vult sperare ea, et quarto vult credere ea, ut credens possit jam sperare et amare et habere.* Sent. L. III. Dist. XXIII., Q. II. a. 5, ad 4m. The desire for eternal happiness, and the initial longing to trust in God that it may be obtained, are, it seems to us, the constituent elements of the *pius affectus.*

[2] Quae tandem mens avida aeternitatis, vitaeque praesentis brevitate permota, contra hujus divinae auctoritatis lumen culmenque contendat? Ep. c. xxxvii. ad Volus, c. iv. n. 16. P. L. t. xxxiii. col. 524.

the existence of God gratuitously. It would be surprising certainly, if the answer to a question of such vital importance was only within the power of a privileged few. The lofty speculations of pure reason are not the only way by which we may come to the certain statement of so practical a truth. The existence of God! Everything that is, shows forth the fact to him who questions; the visible world as surely as the invisible world of the intelligence and heart.

The movements of the heavens no less than the imaginable harmony of miscroscopic organisms, and the astounding and concurrent equilibrium of the countless forces which move the Cosmos, compel our belief in a ruling intelligence distinct from ours, since His thoughts are not our thoughts, possessed of unfathomable power, since He can include the multiple variety of the constituents of the universe in the one and same design.

Nor is it in its origin in time, but during each movement of its existence, that the world with its phenomena has need of a First Cause to regulate its movements. A world which existed from eternity would have required this just as much as a world which began in time. The forces which act round about us cannot act without the continual co-agency of this higher cause. There were no animal life without the sun; no life-giving, heat-producing sun without incandescent matter; and no incandescent matter unless there are cosmic forces to preserve this incandescence. What are these cosmic forces? Do they possess the same nature as all other geotic energies? If this is the case, they too can only act when influenced by a pre-supposed force which moves them. We cannot go backwards indefinitely; we must come to some cause which gives yet receives not, moves yet is not moved, on which all activity depends yet which is itself independent. No great effort of rational analysis is required to perceive in

this cause which possesses in, and of, itself its life and activity, the only reality that is absolutely independent, the Infinite Being Whom we call God.

This intelligent force, quite of another order than the contingent activities from which we obtain our ideas, is still further emphasized by our own thought-experience as the Absolute, Whose unchanging ideal can alone give the reason for the permanency and fixity which our intelligence has discovered beneath the continually changing phenomena of the world.

To the manifestations of speculative reason, not all of which have been mentioned, must be added the evidence of conscience, the imperative call of which, together with the craving for justice forces us to acknowledge a Supreme Master Who alone can impose laws upon human liberty and efficaciously sanction them.

So insistent are these reasons, that no one would ever question God's existence if the attributes which proclaim a First Cause did make Him an incomprehensible Being, a mystery so great that our reason hesitates in its presence, feeling, as it does, the necessity of verifying its demonstration. It is like the mathematician who doubts the value of his most certain calculations when he obtains results which surprise him.[1]

Rather than acknowledge the Infinite Being Who overwhelms them, many thinkers have essayed to destroy the value of the rational deductions which affirm His existence, and to subvert reason itself. They have succeeded in making some metaphysical sceptics; but they have never succeeded in putting

[1] Those who desire a fuller study on the proofs for the existence of God, should consult one or other of the following works: A. D. Sertillanges, O. P. *Les Sources de la Croyance en Dieu*, Paris, 1905; Cl. Piat, *De la Croyance en Dieu*. Paris, 1907; Garrigou-Lagrange, O. P., *Le Sens Commun, la philosophie de l'être et les formules dogmatiques*, Paris, 1909: *Dieu; Son existence et Sa Nature*, Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O. P., Paris, 1915.

anything else in the place of the God they desire to leave out of their explanation of the world, nor have they been able to prevent the immense majority of men—a few sceptics who may doubt but not deny with any assurance, excepted—believing one way or another, in a supreme authority who governs and directs both men and things.

The existence of this supreme authority is so obvious a truth, that reason finds it difficult to resist the strong inclination which drives it to affirm the fact, and not to be satisfied with saying that it is at least probable. Does not this very probability, as also the supernatural intervention of God in the world's history, become a certainty when one has examined the data given throughout this study?

140. More eloquent, however, than the voice of nature is the call Jesus makes to the whole world through the Catholic Church, a call which urges us to return to Our Father in heaven, and to accept that title of adopted sons which the Incarnation, the life and death of the only begotten Son of God have won for us.

Can it be denied that such an appeal comes from One Who has sovereign authority over the moral and physical forces of the world, when we see the heralds of this call laying claim to such authority and, in the moral as well as in the physical order obtaining in its name results such as human and material force have never obtained and which upset every law of history and of nature?

What other power save that of God which Jesus claimed, could have brought about His triumph by means of the Cross of Shame, and have caused Him to be acknowledged as the Messiah and adored as the Risen Son of God?

What other power save that of God could have realized in the victory of Jesus the prophecies of the ancient Jewish documents, as it alone can explain the religious history of the Jewish race?

What other power save that of God could have given to those timorous apostles whom Jesus left behind, the fearlessness and force to conceive of, and triumphantly achieve, the conquest of the world?

What other power save that of God could have changed Saul the persecutor into Paul the great Apostle, and by the arms of patience alone, win the victory over the threefold opposition of the populace, the educated classes, and the imperial power of the Roman Empire?

What other power save that of God could have made the Primitive Church succeed in realizing its efforts at Catholicism, in developing its unifying hierarchy, the guardian of the beliefs which were imposed upon all, despite the many causes for division which human ambition provides in every age, and which were increased at the time by the upheaval brought about by the preaching of new mysteries and the doctrines of the Gospel?

What other power save that of God could have assured to the Church of Rome alone, the continuation of the Catholicity of the Primitive Church, by resisting the disintegration which doctrinal discussions, or national divisions brought about in the Churches separated from her, and of preserving intact that seal of earthly unity which is the inimitable sign of her divine espousals with the Saviour of the world.

What other power save that of God could have preserved to this Church amidst the weaknesses which are inseparable from the onward march of humanity towards sanctity, that superiority of moralizing power which is not hard to recognise and to which many unbelievers and many heretics pay homage?

What other power, in fine, save that of God could have produced within this Church, as evidence of the assistance promised to her, and given to her that she might preserve the teaching of Jesus intact

amongst men, so many miracles, so many wonderful cures which the Gospel tells us shall be the sign of the true Christian teaching?

We believe that we have shown how none of these things admit of any natural explanation, and how all of them postulate the divine. Are we to say that some lying demon has taken possession of nature to make a mockery of men, and reserve the highest geotic forces for knaves and fools that they may deceive their fellows and impose upon their honesty? Must we not confess rather that the invocation of God which is invariably the practice in all such marvels, is not the invocation of a myth or an imaginary power, and that the Almighty Who makes answer to such appeals, has favours for the one who makes them, the Catholic Church, and a predilection which would never be hers if she dared to teach a lying, blasphemous, idolatrous doctrine?

The believer has no doubts as to the answer. The light of faith affords him such an insight into divine things as to make the consideration of even one of these phenomena a sufficient means of confirming his belief in God, in Jesus Christ and the Church.

141. How will he fare, however, who, hesitatingly, has just entered on the way that leads back to truth, and who, while yet a sceptic, undertakes the examination of the reasons for belief? We have mentioned the movements of sympathy which incline such as he towards belief, and we have said that this sympathy does not destroy the aversion it combats. It is not possible to describe all the alternatives of progress and retrogression, of docility and revolt, all the agony through which the soul of the prodigal whom Jesus follows after amidst the fogs of rationalism and materialism, may have to undergo. God alone knows what these souls experience. In the depths to-day, they only wish to see objections; buoyant to-morrow, they perceive

more strongly than ever the attractions and truth of Catholicism. How will the struggle end?

Alas! The natural egotism of man which frets at every law whether of reason or the heart, causes many, unfortunately, to halt midway, and to rest content with the discouraging conclusion of contemporary scepticism: "The history of Catholicism is in truth the most disturbing of enigmas; but, mystery for mystery, I prefer that the mystery of the Church remain unsolved than to believe in that of the Trinity."[1] Such language is foolishness; it is a sin against the Holy Ghost in him who thus sits in judgment on the works of God;[2] it is ruin for the unfortunate unbeliever condemned henceforth to live without light which can help him, without hope to console him, without love which shall lift him above the miseries of life; but unhappily, it is a language which comes all too easily to fallen man.

142. It is otherwise with one who is quickened by grace and prepared by prayer, and the anticipated practice of the Christian life as far as these are possible for an unbeliever. Possessed of a clearer consciousness of our total subordination to God Who calls, of a keener sentiment of the need of God, of a deeper insight into the divine character of the guarantees of revelation, the man who seeks God with his whole soul, and is really anxious *to let himself be guided by truth,* ends by acknowledging how eminently reasonable it is to accept the mystery which uplifts him instead of refusing the solution it affords us, and how unreasonable it is to decry those

[1] Egotism of the spirit, jealously guarded by the limits of its natural point of view, prevents many intelligent men from responding to the call of God. One must acknowledge one's limitations before one can believe. Our Lord has said this already: "Unless you....become as little children you shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven." (St. Matt. xviii. 3.)

[2] The sin is the more serious when the sceptic has clearer knowledge of the signs of the divine authority of the Church: "Woe to thee, Corozain, woe to thee, Bethsaida: for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes." (St. Matt. xi. 21.)

phenomena of moral or physical miracles as enigmatical, when they proclaim so forcibly their cause and purpose. There is no doubt that the mystery of the infinite, and of the dogmas which speak of it in stammering words is disconcerting to reason; but, beyond the fact that they contain nothing contradictory as we hope to show, can any thinking man be so greatly amazed that there should be some things which exceed the measure of his natural concepts? Surely not. And when he will have discovered at last that life consists in belief, that without it there is naught but unrest and helplessness for his higher nature, and hardness or the corruption of earthly pleasures, he will not delay in giving himself to Jesus Christ, saying with St. Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed, and have known that thou art the Christ the Son of God" (S. John vi. 69-70).

APPENDIX I.

Authenticity of the Acts of the Apostles: Date of the composition of this work, and of the Synoptic Gospels.

"It was long considered certain that the Third Gospel was the work of St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul. This would not have increased the value of the Gospel in question, since it only professes to be the work of one who harmonizes the various narratives, and Luke cannot be regarded as a witness of the facts he records. But this traditional view has been destroyed in our day, even with reference to the secondary point. It is admitted, and this is the chief thing, that our third Evangelist and the author of the Acts of the Apostles are one and the same; but it becomes increasingly difficult to believe that a companion of St. Paul such as Luke, could have been so little influenced by him as to appear to be utterly unacquainted with his letters. The great German *savant* Harnack, however, in a recent work, has ingeniously lent the support of his science to the traditional opinion, but his arguments, while they have made orthodox exegetes rejoice, have not, so far as I am aware, shaken the convictions of any liberal critic."[1] It is in this contemptuous manner that M. Guignebert brushes aside an authority and arguments that embarrass him. We shall give a few of these arguments, and shall make use chiefly of the two latest works of Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt* (1906), and *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1908). This note will give our readers the opportunity of appreciating the value of Harnack's discussion and conclusions, as

[1] *Mod et Trad.*, p. 38.

also the contempt of M. Guignebert, and the traditional opinion with regard to the author of the Acts and of the Third Gospel, and the date of their composition.

1. *Authenticity of the Acts and of the Third Gospel.*

The traditional opinion attributes the Third Gospel and the Acts, to St. Luke, a physician, and the companion of St. Paul. The first witnesses in favour of this opinion are very ancient. Previous to St. Irenaeus who writes at length on St. Luke's work,[1] St. Justin, citing passages of the Third Gospel, tells us that he has taken them from "the narratives written by the Apostles and their companions,"[2] an allusion, difficult to dispute, to the two Evangelists who were of the Apostle's company. Furthermore, in the collection of the Four Gospels which preceded Tatian's *Diatessaron*, the Third Gospel was already placed under St. Luke's name; and this collection dates from the middle of the second century, if, indeed, it does not bear an earlier date.

St. Luke's name is never mentioned in the Acts, but it appears in St. Paul's Epistles several times, a fact which gives us very important facts concerning him. He was a Greek by birth, and is named amongst the uncircumcised at the end of the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 10-14); he was a physician, and the well-beloved companion of St. Paul (Col. iv. 14), more loyal than all others (2 Tim. iv. 11), and he preached with the Apostle (Philem. 24). He was together with Mark and St. Paul in Rome, and, perhaps, Caesarea, since the Epistles in which the two are mentioned were sent, those to the Colossians and Philemon from Caesarea, or more probably from Rome, and that to Timothy, from Rome. On the

[1] *Adversus Haereses*. The principal testimony is in Lib. III. C. XIV. P.G., t. VII., col. 913.

[2] *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo*, n° 103, P.G., t. VI., col. 717-720.

other hand, he was absent when St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians and Romans, for no mention is made of him in the detailed greetings of these Epistles; unless, indeed the omission is accounted for by the fact that he was quite unknown and indifferent to these communities at the time.

We possess then, many characteristics regarding St. Luke's personality. If all these characteristics are to be found in the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts, how can we reject the conviction that tradition is right, and that those who formed the collection of the Gospels in the first half of the second century, did not invent the most illustrious writer they could imagine as the author of these two documents, since Timothy, Barnabas and many others were better fitted than St. Luke to receive the credit for the work of an anonymous writer?

1. *The author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles is a Greek by birth.* Harnack does not stop to discuss this proposition, which is no longer disputed by critics, but, having simply urged the reading of the narratives in question, he cites as a picturesque and characteristic feature in a Greek, the manner with which the author of the Acts treats as barbarians the people of Malta who did not speak Greek (Acts xxxviii. 2-4).[1] One does not require an extensive knowledge of Greek to see that the language of St. Luke, while not purely classical, nevertheless, employs, too many words, phrases and periods to have been the language of a Semite, like the Greek of the other books of the New Testament. The literary corrections which the author of the Third Gospel makes are also very significant in this regard. It is true that we find many Aramaic expressions in the Third Gospel and in the Acts; but when we bear in mind the fact that these expressions

[1] *Luke the Physician.* Eng. trans., p. 13, note. London, 1909.

are always to be found in passages in which the author has made use of Aramean sources, whether written or oral, and specially in the first chapters of the Gospel and the Acts, and that they are never met with in his narratives of what he himself had thought or seen, the objection loses its force.

2. *The author of the Third Gospel and the Acts is a physician.* "Of course, in making such a statement," writes Harnack, "one still exposes oneself to the scorn of the critics, and yet the arguments which are alleged in its support are simply convincing."[1] The medical terms and the details which the author introduces into his narrative of the facts he witnessed, of those he takes from St. Mark, of the miracles or parables he describes from his own particular sources, are so numerous and so characteristic that they do not permit us to doubt that a physician is speaking. And it is as the physician that he still reveals himself in his understanding of the work of Jesus, as that of healing diseased humanity.

One of the last narratives which the author of the Acts gives as an eyewitness is particularly significant. Paul and his shipwrecked companions after great hardships got safely to the island of Malta in cold and rainy weather. The people kindled a fire to refresh them. "And when Paul had gathered together a bundle of sticks, and had laid them on the fire, a viper coming out of the heat (ἀπὸ τῆς θέρμης), fastened on his hand (κατέσχεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ). And when the barbarians saw the beast (θηρίον) hanging (κρεμάμενον) on his hand, they said one to another: Undoubtedly this man is a murderer, who, though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance doth not

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-14. The arguments to which Harnack refers are those given by Hobart in *The Medical Language of St. Luke*. (Dublin, 1882.) Hobart had discovered no less than 400 words peculiar to St. Luke which are only to be found in medical works. This was too much. A number of these words are to be met with in the Septuagint. His statement casts discredit on his work and robbed Hobart's conclusions of all authority in the eyes of those critics who did not take the trouble to read his volume and to discover that his reasons were absolutely convincing. Cf. *Luke the Physician*. Appendix I., pp. 175-198.

suffer him to live. And he shaking off the beast (θηρίον) into the fire, suffered no harm. And they supposed that he would begin to swell up (πίμπρασθαι), and that he would suddenly fall down and die (καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν). But expecting long, and seeing that there came no harm to him (μηδὲν ἄτοπον), changing their minds, they said that he was a God.

Now in these places were possessions of the chief man of the island, named Publius, who receiving us, for three days entertained us courteously. And it happened that the father of Publius lay sick of a fever, and of a bloody flux (πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίᾳ συνεχόμενον).

To whom Paul entered in; and when he had prayed, and laid his hands on him, he healed him. Which being done, all that had diseases in the island, came and were healed. (ἐθεραπεύοντο) Who also honoured us with many honours (ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς) and when we were to set sail, they laded us with such things as were necessary." (Acts xxviii. 2-10).

Θηρίον, is the medical term used for a viper which is commonly called ἔχιδνα : hence the antidote made from the flesh of the reptile is called θηριακή. Θέρμη a word which is only found here in the New Testament, is the word employed in medical treatises instead of θερμότης to signify heat. Καθῆψεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ "fastened on his hand," is rendered in the Vulgate as "*invasit manum ejus,*" but neither of these translations fully convey the Greek meaning. They do not say whether the viper "bit" St. Paul or not; whereas the word in the Acts is definite, though the precise meaning it has here is not generally given in lexicons and can only be paraphrased. It is a technical medical term, and points to the introduction of a poison into the body. Hence it should be translated by "it inflicted a poisonous wound on the hand." The medical excerpt in which the harm wrought by this poison is described may be read in Hobart (*op. cit.*, p. 283). πίμπρασθαι and καταπίπτειν are words only to

be found here in the New Testament and are technical terms used to describe a "swelling" and the case where a man falls down dead. (Hobart, p. 50.) The expression *μηδέν ἄτοπον* is peculiar to St. Luke and signifies literally "nothing extraordinary," but in medical language *ἄτοπον* means "a mortal accident," thus Galen states "that those who drink a certain antidote after having been bitten by a mad dog *εἰς οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἐμπεσοῦνται ῥᾳδίως* (Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 179). *πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίᾳ συνεχόμενοι*· the plural *πυρετοί* which is found only here in the New Testament is also special to medical terminology, and its conjunction with *δυσεντερίᾳ* gives the technical description of intestinal inflammation from which the father of Publius suffered (Hobart, p. 52). Must the commentary given by Harnack be accepted? He is of opinion that the narrator, in attributing to himself contrary to his usual custom, part of the honours paid to St. Paul (*ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς*), and in not saying that the other sick people of the island were cured by Paul (*ἐθεραπεύοντο* without complement), discreetly suggests that he himself had given medical treatment to a number of sick people who had come when they heard of the first miracles. This interpretation possesses some probability, but there is no need to accept it in order to see that the author of the diary of the voyage was a physician. This conviction will be strengthened, if there is need to do so, by the use of the terms *καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ* to express sleep (xx. 9), *ἐπιμέλεια* to express "medical care" (xxvii. 3), and specially by the singular expression: *βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον* "*they use helps undergirding the ship*" (xxvii. 17), a medical formula which is strangely applied to the strengthening of a ship.[1]

It is not merely in the narratives of the voyage that the writer shows he is a physician; this characteristic is also shown clearly in the Evangelist, whose medical knowledge is exhibited in the

[1] *Cf.* Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 11; pp. 123-126; and chiefly Hobart, *op. cit.*

corrections he has made in all the narratives of the cures taken from St. Mark. In order to be brief we shall only examine two of these narratives. St. Mark says of the woman with an issue of blood, that: "*She had suffered many things from many physicians: and had spent all that she had, and was nothing the better, but rather worse*" (v. 26).

This was hard on the physicians, and the author of the Third Gospel tones it down: She "had bestowed all her substance on physicians, and could not be healed by any." (viii. 43.) St. Mark describes the healing of the poor woman rather unskilfully: "*the fountain of her blood was dried up*" (v. 29). The author of the Third Gospel gives us the technical terms found in medical treatises: *Immediately the issue of her blood stopped,* ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς (viii. 44).

A comparison between the two narratives of the raising to life of the daughter of Jairus is no less significant.

St. Mark (v. 41-43).

And taking the damsel by the hand, he saith to her: Talitha cumi, which is, being interpreted: Damsel (I say to thee) arise. And immediately the damsel rose up and walked: and she was twelve years old, and they were astonished with a great astonishment. And he charged them straitly that no man should know it: and commanded that something should be given her to eat.

St. Luke (viii. 54, 56).

But he taking her by the hand, cried out, saying: Maid, arise. And her spirit returned, and she arose immediately. And he bid them give her to eat. And her parents were astonished whom he charged to tell no man what was done.

St. Mark is taken up with the effect produced on those present, and, telling us first that the maid walked, only thinks of saying at the end of his narrative that Jesus "commanded that something should be given her to eat." The physician who has retouched this narrative, is concerned on the other hand with the sick girl, tells us how "her spirit returned," does not make her walk until she had eaten, and only thinks of the by-standers when he has told us how the maid's needs were seen to.

Take the case of Malchus. Both St. Mark and St. Matthew relate that St. Peter cut off his ear, but St. Luke alone informs us how the Divine Physician, Jesus, restored it.

The same undeniable traces of medical knowledge are found in the narratives which the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts takes from unknown oral or written sources. We shall only mention some of those to which Hobart and Harnack direct attention.

In the raising from death of the Widow's Son and Tabitha of Lydda, their first movement is expressed by the verb ἀνεκάθισεν (Luke vii. 15; Acts ix. 40). This verb is only employed in medicine in an intransitive sense, and signifies the "sitting up" of the sick person.

The narrative of the healing of the woman who was bowed down is also of interest from the same point of view:—"*(Jesus) was teaching in their synagogue on their sabbath. And behold there was a woman, who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years: and she was bowed together* (συγκύπτουσα), *neither could she look upwards* (ἀνακύψαι) *at all. Whom when Jesus saw, he called her unto him, said to her: Woman, thou art delivered* (ἀπολέλυσαι) *from thy infirmity. And he laid hands upon her, and immediately she was made straight* (ἀνωρθώθη) *and glorified God.*" (Luke xiii. 10-13.)

Is not the apparent violation of the Sabbath repose, and the discussion which follows, the chief circumstance of this scene? Yet, however important the principal idea may be, it does not prevent a physician from informing us of the state of the sick woman. There are four technical terms in the brief description; and the mention of the duration of the malady is also worthy of remark. St. Matthew and St. Mark do this but once, in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, when the mention of the duration of the malady was not pleasing to the physicians. This circumstance of the

length of time had little interest for ordinary people, but it was of great interest to physicians and so it will be noted in the Acts where we are told that the lame man in the Temple had been so for forty years (iv. 22), and from birth (iii. 2), that Eneas, the paralytic of Lydda "had kept his bed for eight years" (ix. 33), and that the cripple of Lystra had been afflicted "from his mother's womb" (xiv. 8).

No other Evangelist employs so many different terms (*κράββατος, κλίνη, κλινίδιον, κλινάριον*) to express "a sick bed." Some object that the anointing of wounds with a mixture of oil and wine mentioned in the Parable of the Good Samaritan was not a medical prescription: but it is found in a treatise of Hippocrates (*Morb. Mul.* 656). The description, at once so precise and so picturesque in its brevity, of the cure of the lame man in the Temple, is that of a practitioner who was accustomed to observe the structure and movements of the human body. '*(Peter) taking him by the right hand, lifted him up, and forthwith his feet and soles* (*σφυδρά*) *received strength. And he leaping up, stood, and walked.*' (Acts iii. 7, 8). *Σφυδρά* is an extremely rare expression, not to be met with in ordinary lexicons; Galen gives it (*Medicus* X. xiv. 108), as the technical term for ankle.

The Parable of Lazarus and Dives, the narratives of the cure of the dropsical man, of Saul, the cripple of Lystra, the blindness of Elymas, the story of Ananias and Sapphira, and Peter's vision afford occasions for similar comments. We may be excused for not entering further into the matter, but we have sufficiently shown how well founded is the certitude with which Hobart and Harnack affirm the truth of the traditional opinion, that the author of these narratives was a physician.

3. *The author of the Gospel and the Acts was a companion of St. Paul.* Objections have multiplied against this proposition. We are told that the author

of the Third Gospel and the Acts could not have been a companion of St. Paul, for he does not follow St. Paul in doctrine, is not acquainted with his Epistles, makes no mention of his conflicts with the Judaizers, and if he alludes to the subject once it is simply to speak of a Council of Jerusalem, whose history and decree are irreconcilable with the Epistle to the Galatians and St. Paul's teaching.

The "we" in the second part of the Acts refers certainly to a companion of Paul, but the narratives in which it occurs are fragments of a diary of the voyage,[1] which the compiler of the Acts has inserted in his work without effacing the "We." The disdain of which the clumsy insertion of this pronoun has been the occasion cannot last long in face of the conclusions of a critical examination of the whole work.

It is quite true that the Third Gospel and the Acts have not the deep theological perceptions of St. Paul's Epistles with regard to the law, faith, sin and grace. But there was no occasion that the Third Gospel should possess them, in that its object was to give the preaching of Jesus preparatory to the kingdom, preaching in which this theology was not developed, which was only revealed indeed, by the great facts of the Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and of Pentecost meditated upon in the light of the Spirit sent by Jesus. It is facts rather than doctrine to which the author of the Acts holds. Is such pragmatism inconceivable in a companion of St. Paul? Did mere companionship with him impart Paul's profound sense of supernatural realities to his companions? The history of the Churches of Asia Minor which were established by this great Apostle and in which his theology has left so few traces, is sufficient to teach us what we are to think of the supposition that all his disciples must have been theologians like

[1] In German *Wirstücke*, in French "journal de route"=the mass of passages of the Acts where the author in using the pronoun "We," puts himself forward as the eye-witness and companion of St. Paul in his journeys. It is not always easy to say with precision where these passages begin and end. Harnack confines them approximately to the following pericopes: xv. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxviii. 1; xxviii. 16.

himself. Moreover, the Third Gospel and the Acts are indubitably stamped with Pauline characteristics, not only in the matter of vocabulary,[1] but also in the insistence with which the Author of the Acts emphasizes in his narratives, the Pauline doctrines concerning the action of the Holy Ghost, and gratuitous election, in the narrative of the Last Supper which reproduces the details and characteristic expressions of 1 Cor. xi. 23, 25 (*cf.* Luke xxii. 19, 20), and by the terminology in which the insufficiency of the Mosaic law to effect justification is affirmed. *Be it known therefore to you, men, brethren, that through him forgiveness of sin is preached to you: and from all the things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses. In him every one that believeth is justified.* (Acts xiii. 38-39.)

The Epistles of St. Paul were unknown to the author of the Acts. He made no use of them, it is true, and this is proof that he had composed his work before these Epistles had been diffused amongst the communities. He could well be ignorant of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, which were written at a time when, as the diary of the voyage testifies, he was not with St. Paul. As regards the other Epistles, if they were written in Rome after the date with which his book ends, he could not refer to them. It is even possible that he never dreamt of mentioning those which might have been written at Caesarea. His attention was directed before everything else to taking note of the phases and dramatic incidents in St. Paul's life, and such being the case, the sending of a letter was an unimportant event.

[1] "St. Matt. and St. Paul have twenty-nine words in common which are not to be found elsewhere in the Gospels. St. Mark and St. Paul have twenty such words in common. St. John and St. Paul seventeen words; St. Luke (Gospel) and St. Paul, however, have eighty-four such words in common which are not to be found elsewhere in the gospels." Harnack, *op. cit.*, p, 20, note. One hundred and seventeen words, not to be found in any other N.T. narratives, are met with in the Epistles of St. Paul, the III Gospel, and the Acts; and one hundred and seventy-five words in the Epistles of St. Paul and one or other of the Lukan writings. *Cf.* Jacquier. *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament t. iii* p. 25.

The author of the Acts does not mention the conflicts in which St. Paul was engaged with the Judaizers. Was he really obliged to insist upon these intestinal dissensions in an apologetic narrative of the victories of the Gospel which was addressed to a Greek neophyte whose faith he was anxious to strengthen? He does not noise abroad these dissensions, but neither is he silent concerning them when the trend of his narrative obliges him to mention them (xv.), nor does he make any mystery of the little sympathy shown to St. Paul by the community at Jerusalem, despite the alms which the Apostle brought it. Nor may anyone object that the Acts present us with a Judaizing Paul in contradiction with the teaching of the Epistles. The Apostle who so passionately defended the liberty of the Gentiles thought it good for the Jew to preserve his customs: *Is any man called being circumcised, let him not procure uncircumcision. . . Let every man abide in the same calling in which he was called* (1 Cor. vii. 18, 20). When the Acts inform us that St. Paul had Timothy circumcised "because of the Jews who were in those places" (xvi. 1, 3), that he offered an oblation in the temple (xxi. 21-26), they do no more than give a commentary on the words of the Apostle: *I made myself the servant of all, that I might gain the more. And I became to the Jews, a Jew, that I might gain the Jews. To them that are under the law, as if I were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law,) that I might gain them that were under the law* (1 Cor. ix. 19-20).

The difficulty of reconciling the narrative of Acts xv., and the decree there mentioned with the Epistle to the Galatians and St. Paul's teaching, is the only serious one. It is the second time the Acts make Paul and Barnabas come from Antioch to Jerusalem; a first visit is recorded in xi. 29-30; and xii. 25. Which of these visits corresponds with that mentioned by St. Paul in Galatians ii.? We cannot

say which with any certainty, since the details given by the Apostle may agree with either visit though they do not exactly fit in with one or the other![1] Still, even though we emphasize the divergencies, we cannot impute an error to the Acts such as St. Luke could not have committed.

Critics, believers as well as unbelievers, are just as divided on the question of the decree issued by the assembly at Jerusalem. The original text of this decree is not yet settled by textual criticism, and is not likely to be for a long time. The various readings of the manuscripts may be reduced to two principal ones, of which, one, the Eastern, is represented by the testimony of the Greek Fathers and all the old manuscripts except one; and the other, the Western, has the authority of the Codex Bezae and the Latin Fathers. The Eastern manuscript reads: "*It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things: That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled* (πνικτοῦ) *and from fornication from which thing, keeping yourselves, you shall do well.* (Acts xv. 28-29.) The presence of the term πνικτοῦ will not allow us to doubt that the "things sacrificed to idols, and....blood" mean the food sold in the market after it had been offered to idols, and the blood of animal food which was held in particular disgust by the Jews, as also the flesh of strangled animals. Having declared that the Gentile neophytes were free from the obligations imposed by the Mosaic law, the authorities demanded, as a means of facilitating intercourse between them and their Jewish brethren, that they should observe certain prohibitions contained in this law which was read "every Sabbath (v. 21), prohibitions which daily practice had rendered dear and sacred to the Judaeo-Christians." The Western manuscript reads differently: "*It hath seemed good . . . that you*

[1] Jacquier, *op. cit.*, t. iii. 6. 140.

abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from fornication, and that you shall not do unto another that which you would not that another should do unto you." The absence of the term πνικτῶν gives quite another meaning to the decree, and the addition of the precept of charity determines its interpretation in the sense of an interdiction of idolatrous practices, homicidal violence and impurity. Thus the decree is a kind of moral catechism.

Which of the two is authentic? Has the term πνικτῶν been placed beside αἵματος (blood) in justification of Jewish practices which had passed from the Jews to the Gentiles without the intervention of any law? Or has the term πνικτῶν been deleted in order that the conciliar decree may be brought into keeping with the practice which obtained amongst the Gentiles? The question is strongly controverted.[1]

After having long upheld the authenticity of the Eastern reading, Harnack now confesses that he feels obliged to change his opinion and hold to that of the Western manuscript.[2]

We do not presume to make any statement. The Western reading is fully in keeping with the writings of St. Paul, yet many Catholic exegetes uphold the authenticity of the other version. In fact the contradiction between the decree thus worded and the teaching and practice of the Apostle is more apparent than real. The decree which proclaims the liberty of the Gentiles, demands that the Christian communities of Syria and Cilicia for whom it is promulgated, and which include a large number of loyal Jews, shall abstain from those practices which most offend the Christians who have come from the synagogue. It is the application of the principle laid down by St. Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 13: "*If meat scandalize my brother.*" The danger of scandal did not last long: with the

[1] *Cf. Le Décret des Apôtres,* in the *Revue Biblique,* 1907, pp. 31, 218, by M. Coppieters.

[2] *Die Apostelgeschichte,* C. VI, p. 190, *sqq.*

increase of the Gentiles in the Church, the reason which had given rise to the prescriptions of Jerusalem disappeared; and their application did not extend to those Churches where the Jews were either few or not at all.

It does not seem impossible, therefore, that the Acts should have been composed by a missionary who had lived with Paul during his journeys and his stay in Rome. The difficulties which we have discussed may leave some lingering doubts in the mind, but they disappear before the positive reasons which prove that the author of the Acts was a companion of St. Paul.

Renan, having examined, while he exaggerated, the objections that may be brought against the authenticity of the Acts which he frequently accuses of error, concludes as follows: "Need these objections check us? I do not think so, and I persist in believing that the final compiler of the *Acts* was indeed the disciple of Paul who says "we" in the last chapters. All difficulties, however insoluble they may appear, must be, if not dispelled, at least held in suspense by an argument so decisive as that which results from the word "we." It should be added that, by attributing the *Acts* to a companion of Paul, two important peculiarities are explained: on the one hand, the disproportion of the parts of the book, of which more than three-fifths are devoted to Paul; on the other, the disproportion in Paul's biography itself, his first mission being described with great brevity, while certain portions of the second and third missions, especially the last journeys, are related in minute detail. A man entirely foreign to apostolic history would not have had these inequalities. The general plan of his work would have been better conceived. What distinguishes history compiled from documents, from history written wholly or in part at first hand, is precisely lack of proportion; the historian of the study taking the events themselves as the framework of his narrative, the author

of memoirs taking as his framework his recollections, or at least his personal relations. An ecclesiastical historian, a kind of Eusebius, writing about the year 120, would have bequeathed to us a book quite differently arranged from Chapter xiii. onward. The curious fashion in which the Acts at that moment leaves the orbit in which it has so far revolved is, in my opinion, only to be explained by the peculiar position of the author and his relations with Paul." [1]

The supposition that the "we" has been left in by the compiler who made use of the diary of the voyage is quite improbable. How could an author who was accustomed to correct his sources as the Third Gospel testifies, have left in the "we" inadvertently? Or how can he be supposed to have left it in deliberately with a view to having himself regarded as an eyewitness, when he has not put it in all the narratives of the second part of the Acts? And, when it is borne in mind that the two books addressed to Theophilus must have had a signature as well as an address, how can it be imagined that he to whom the books were addressed, or the Churches, should have effaced the signature of the author who claimed to be an eyewitness, in order that the signature of Luke, the least known of St. Paul's disciples, might be substituted?

Compared with such improbabilities, of what value is the difficulty in explaining the negligence with which the author introduces himself "ex abrupto," without warning the reader? This curious way of introducing himself is explained, not only because he customarily introduces all his secondary personages in a similar way, but especially by the fact that, in addressing his book to a friend, and having begun it by saying: "It seemed good to me: The former treatise I made," [2] in the first person, he

[1] *Les Apôtres*. Introduction. Eng. trans. by W. G. Hutchinson, p. 17. London. 1905.

[2] St. Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1.

knew that the "we" would appear natural and intelligible to him for whom he had written.

Furthermore, the matter and style of the diary of the voyage clearly show that the author has the same mind and sympathies, the same style and terminology as the compiler of the entire Acts and of the Third Gospel.

All proportion being preserved, the diary does not contain fewer narratives of the marvellous than the rest of the work and the author dwells upon them with as much satisfaction. He describes an exorcism for us in a few lines (xvi. 16), a cure of a fever-patient by the imposition of hands (xxviii. 7), numerous other cures of a similar kind are briefly narrated (xxviii. 9), a case of miraculous preservation from snake-bite (xxviii. 3), a resuscitation from death (xx. 9, *et seq.*), prophecies spoken by the disciples at Tyre (xxi. 4), by Agabus (xxi. 11), by the daughters of Philip the deacon, (xxi. 9), by Paul (xxi. 25, 29), Paul's vision at Troas (xvi. 9), and of an angelic apparition (xxvii. 23). Does not the cry of the girl at Philippi who had "a pythonical spirit," "*These men are the servants of the most High God*" (Acts xvi. 17), recall that of the possessed man of the Gerasens: "*What have I to do with thee, Jesus, Son of the most High God*" (St. Luke viii. 28)? If St. Paul, in the diary of the voyage appears more lifelike, is it not because the author describes more vividly what he sees with his own eyes? And when the compiler of the first part of the Acts, in narrating that Philip evangelized the cities along the coast makes special mention of Caesarea without telling us why, is it not simply because he had met, and had personally known, this same Philip at Caesarea as the diary informs us?

An examination of the style and terminology of the diary of the voyage, when it is separated from, and compared with, the rest of the literary work attributed to St. Luke gives occasion for further significant observations. We can only give the facts which

Harnack points out, and refer to his book, *Luke the Physician* (pp. 19-85), where they are examined in detail. Having analysed verse by verse the first and last pericopes of the diary (xvi. 10-17; xxviii. 1-16), Harnack has met with expressions and formulas in each verse which are to be found in the other parts of the Acts and of the Third Gospel. Comparing the vocabulary of the diary with that of the Third Gospel and the Acts, we discover 130 words common to each, 63 of which are not found in the writings of any other Evangelist. . . . If, on the other hand, this same vocabulary is compared with that of St. Matthew, there are only 3 words in common which are not met with in the other Gospels or in the Acts. A comparison under the same conditions with St. Mark and St. John gives us 1 and 2 words in common.

To escape the conviction which arises from such statements, the objection is put forward that the 90 verses of the diary of the voyage contain 111 words which are not met with in the Acts or the Third Gospel. The proportion of words used only once, of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* is nearly three times as much in the diary as in the rest of the Acts. Does not this prove that we are dealing here with the work of another writer? The proof indeed, would have some force if half of the diary was not devoted to the narrative of a journey by sea, where there are no fewer than 69 technical expressions used. Setting aside such technical terms, there remain about 40 *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, a proportion which does not greatly exceed the average of the Acts. Even in those very passages where the nature of the subject necessitated so many new terms, the style and vocabulary is still that of St. Luke, without any trace of Greek foreign to him such as is to be met with in those Gospel narratives where he utilizes St. Mark's Gospel. This last fact leads us to distinguish four parts in St. Luke's work, from the view-point of style and vocabulary: 1—The two prologues of the Gospel and the Acts, the diary of the voyage and the second portion of the

Acts generally; here we have the pure Greek of the author without admixture of heterogeneous elements: 2—The first two Chapters of the Gospel and the first twelve chapters of the Acts. The style and vocabulary of the diary are still the preponderating element of the compilation, but at the same time many Septuagint and Aramaic expressions are met with, while there is no trace that any Greek source has been utilized. The sources used in this portion could only be written or oral Aramaic sources. 3—The narratives taken from St. Mark, which are, relatively speaking, many, three-fifths of St. Mark's Gospel having been incorporated into the Gospel of St. Luke. These narratives are very much retouched in the style of the Acts, yet not so greatly as to prevent us from discovering very easily many formulas and expressions of St. Mark. 4—The groups of texts composed by the almost entire discourses of the Lord. Their Greek is that of a translation from the Aramaic, not made by St. Luke, but slightly corrected, and retouched sufficiently to allow us easily to recognize them as the work of the hand which wrote the diary of the voyage, and which has left on the whole work an imprint sufficiently uniform and characteristic to prevent any one from denying to him its definite composition.

These conclusions of the minute examination to which Harnack has subjected the Acts of the Apostles, together with the other arguments already given, do not permit us to doubt that the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts is one, who in all sincerity could present himself as an eyewitness of those incidents where he writes "We." He was a companion of St. Paul.

There is no need of a special section to show that this companion of St. Paul, a Greek and physician, possesses the other characteristics of St. Luke. The absence and presence of the "We" in the different narratives of the Acts, show us clearly that their compiler was not with St. Paul at Corinth or Ephesus

when he wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Galatians, the Romans and Corinthians, but that he was with the Apostle at Caesarea and Rome. The author of the Acts seems to be acquainted with St. Mark in a special manner, since he knows the names of his mother's servant (Acts xii. 13) and informs us that he also preached the Gospel in company with St. Paul (Acts xvi. 10-13). And when from all those characteristics we recognize the Luke of the Epistles, we understand why we never find his name amongst the numerous companions of St. Paul who are spoken of in the Acts. The "We," and the signature of his book mention it plainly enough to his friend and to the readers to whom he addressed himself; even to-day their testimony is sufficiently clear and quite incontestable.

2. *Date of composition of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels.*

The *Acts of the Apostles* must certainly have been written before the year 93, the date of Domitian's persecution which extended throughout the whole empire the hostilities against the Christians that began under Nero. If St. Luke had written either during or after a general persecution, he would not have described so simply, or without allusion to the resolute ill-will of the Roman authorities, the often benevolent, usually impartial, and rarely hostile manner in which the Imperial magistrates treated the first missionaries.

We can go back still further. The independent character of the *Acts of the Apostles* with reference to details of fact and doctrine, compared with the Epistles of St. Paul, shows that their author did not know, and had not made use of, these Epistles, and that the affinity of ideas and terminology which he possessed with the Apostle, arose solely from the fact that for a long time he had been his companion and disciple. If St. Luke had known the Epistle to the

Galatians and those to the Corinthians, he would have given us more precise details of St. Paul's journeys to Jerusalem, details more fully in agreement with the solemn affirmations of the Apostle: nor would he have been so concise in his treatment of the early history of the Church of Corinth. One must be ready, deliberately, to accept any improbability, to suppose that an unknown author, writing at the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century, instead of giving authority to his narrative by utilizing the certain and precise data afforded by the Epistles should have been so foolish as deliberately to correct the statements which were known and received everywhere in the hope that his testimony would be preferred to that of St. Paul. But St. Paul's Epistles, written between A.D. 50 and A.D. 60, were quickly disseminated amongst the Christian Churches as their use by St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Polycarp testifies. It is hardly probable that the author of the Acts writing in Rome, in Macedonia or in Asia Minor after the year 80, should not have known them. We must then refer them back at least to the time of the composition of the Acts. This was the conclusion arrived at by Harnack in this chronology of ancient Christian literature published in 1897.[1] He has changed his opinion since. "The political maxim *Quieta non movere* does not hold in scientific matters," he writes in a recent work, "it will be necessary to decide to treat this question anew, or to leave it an open question if decisive arguments are not forthcoming." Meanwhile he suggests the following solution: "Luke wrote at the time of Titus, or in the first years of Domitian, *but perhaps, shortly after the year 60.*"[2]

This latter date is that of the traditional opinion; Harnack is strongly tempted to return to it, and for reasons which, to him seem solid and to us decisive. They would be decisive for every one if the

[1] *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur*, t. I, pp. 247-250.

[2] *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Exkurs. V, p. 221.

composition of the Acts about the year 60, preceded by the composition of the Third Gospel, did not give unbelieving criticism the impossible task of explaining how the legends which it professes to find in Gospel history came into existence so quickly and so soon after the death of Jesus.

Harnack singles out three from among the many objections against the traditional opinion regarding the compilation of the Acts, as the only ones of any seeming compilation. 1—The Prologue of St. Luke's Gospel, to judge from the way it speaks of events which have occurred, narratives already told, eye-witnesses, seems to suppose that it was already published some fifty years after the death of Jesus. 2—The details which St. Luke adds relative to the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the omission of the warning he *that readeth let him understand* inserted in the prophetic discourse by St. Mark xiv. 13, and St. Matt. xxiv. 15, appear to indicate that St. Luke's compilation is subsequent to the occurrence. 3—It is difficult to explain how the Gospel legends, especially those of the appearances of the risen Jesus and of the Ascension, could have sprung into existence and have developed before the destruction of Jerusalem.[1]

What is the worth of these statements? The third statement is neither critical nor historical, and has no value except for those, who, with Harnack, deny *à priori* the possibility of all supernatural phenomena, and will only see legends in the narratives which record them. The first, according to the testimony of Harnack himself, is not very solid. Why should St. Luke be unable to speak in the beginning of his Gospel thirty years after Our Lord's death, of the great things which had been accomplished, of the numerous narratives in which persons attempted to describe them, and of his preference for the testimony of eyewitnesses? The second statement is of greater weight and deserves closer examination.

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 127.

St. Luke has been more exact in his announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem, than either St. Mark or St. Matthew, as the following texts show:—

St. Luke xxi. 20-21.

And when you shall see Jerusalem compassed about with an army; then know that the destruction thereof is at hand. Then let those who are in Judea, flee to the mountains: and those who are in the midst thereof, depart out: and those who are in the countries, not enter into it.

St. Mark xiii. 14.

And when you shall see the abomination of desolation, standing where it ought not: he that readeth let him understand, then let them that are in Judea, flee unto the mountains.

St. Matthew xxiv. 15-16.

When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place: he that readeth let him understand.

Furthermore, while the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world are so combined in the compilation of St. Mark and St. Matthew, that the two events might be regarded as consecutive, St. Luke plainly indicates the indefinite period which shall divide them: *And they (the Jews)...shall be led away captives into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles; till the times of the nations be fulfilled.* (xxi. 24.)

Can we really infer from these differences that the composition is subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem? Let us suppose, that the unbelieving critic must prove, that these corrections and additions do not depend upon the independent tradition of St. Mark or St. Matthew, which would have collected, preserved and more faithfully interpreted, the prophetic teaching of Jesus. Did St. Luke, a Greek and writing for Greeks, desirous of making the Jewish citation from Daniel intelligible to them, and of explaining the abomination of desolation, need to be taught by events, to understand that Jerusalem, from which its inhabitants were urged to fly, and which was already in a continual state of hostility with Rome,

would be destroyed by war? This interpretation was suggested to him by the very text of Daniel to which they refer. Is not the abomination of desolation connected with the cessation of sacrifice in Daniel (xii. 11)? and is not this cessation of sacrifice with an analogous announcement of abomination, spoken of in this same book of Daniel (xi. 27), as a consequence of the war which shall destroy the holy city? When St. Luke had given this explanation of the prophetic announcement, he did not require to add *he that readeth let him understand.* With regard to the "times of the nations," if the text of the eschatological discourse in St. Mark and St. Matthew does not mention them explicitly, it does not exclude them: nay more, the contents of the two Gospels, and consequently, the full teaching of tradition with which St. Luke was acquainted, pre-suppose them. Is it then, to be wondered at, that the Greek Evangelist, faithful to his special purpose of announcing salvation to the Gentiles, and to his custom of elucidating and putting in order the narratives of his predecessors, should himself have had the idea of indicating more explicitly "the times of the nations" and of more clearly recording that the work of their salvation was not bound up with the fortunes of the Jewish Government?

What would be more astonishing—and in making this remark, we approach the positive proof of traditional opinion—what would be inconceivable, would be that St. Luke, who had been careful to tell us that the little prophecy of Agabus anent the famine under Claudius (Acts xi. 28), was fulfilled, should not have dreamt of telling us how the far more important prophecy of the Master had been accomplished, if he had written after the destruction of Jerusalem. Never do we discover the slightest allusion in the Acts to the wretched condition of the Jews throughout the Roman world after the war in Judea and the destruction of Jerusalem. St. Luke always shows them as having an assured position, a

definite standing in the empire, and as possessing full authority in Jerusalem under the supervision of the procurator. When at the end of the Acts he cites the prophecy of Isaiah regarding the hardness of the hearts of the Jews he says no word of the evils which were the punishment of this sin. This silence can only be explained by the composition of the Acts before the great catastrophe.

Want of knowledge of St. Paul's Epistles, concerning which we have already spoken, cannot be understood any better after the year 70 than after the year 80: it was not possible in St. Luke except during St. Paul's lifetime, when the Apostle's writings had not yet obtained in all the Christian communities the publicity and authority which a few more years and the glorious martyrdom of their author would assure to them.

Lastly, the conclusion of the Acts supposes that St. Paul is alive when St. Luke wrote: *Paul remained two whole years in his own hired lodging; and he received all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, without prohibition.* (xxviii. 30-31.) If St. Paul had already suffered martyrdom, could St. Luke have concluded his work by telling us he was alive? Or could he have boasted of the freedom with which the Gospel was preached in Rome if he had known of Nero's persecution?

It has been said that, this conclusion is not a conclusion; that the Acts are the second part of a work the conclusion of which was to have been in a third part. The third part, in which St. Luke purposed to relate the death of St. Paul, either never appeared or it was lost. Harnack qualifies this supposition as a most unlikely expedient,[1] the entire probability of which rests on a misunderstanding of St. Luke's purpose and plan. One must assume that the Acts are a life of St. Peter and St. Paul to

[1] *Ein wenig wahrscheinlicher Notbehelf, in Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 50.

attribute to their author the intention of writing a third book in which he proposed to relate the history of the martyrdom of these saints. But the Acts are not a life of St. Paul any more than they are a biography of St. Peter. However important their place in the Acts, the two Apostles are only mentioned in the book according as St. Luke beheld them labouring in the work he was desirous to record. The Acts are the history of the victory of that Gospel which was first preached to the Jews, then rejected by them and welcomed by the Gentiles; which was persecuted in Jerusalem, and freely preached in Rome. When St. Luke has shown us St. Paul persecuted by the Jews preaching in Rome, the centre of paganism, as freely and with as great success as in the other great cities of the empire, he has sufficiently accomplished his purpose and has justified the concluding reflection which is the subject and moral conclusion of the Acts: *Be it known therefore to you (Jews), that this salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles, and they will hear it* (Acts xxviii. 28).

The history of St. Paul's martyrdom and of the persecutions which then began, are an objection to this thesis which the author did not foresee even when he wrote these words: else he would have mentioned them.

That Harnack, having explained these statements and others of less importance, should hesitate to fix a date for the composition of the Acts which renders the explanation of the formation of the pretended Gospel legends impossible, is not surprising: we, however, who are not restrained by the same scruples, have no such hesitation. The Acts were certainly written before 70, and very probably before the death of St. Paul, about 64 or 65. Previous to the Acts, however, St. Luke had written his Gospel. This Gospel, in its turn, pre-supposes the Gospel of St. Mark which it in great part reproduces, and, furthermore, the entire collection of

the discourses of Our Lord, written already in Aramaic if not already translated into Greek, which we meet with in the Gospel of St. Luke, and, at the same time, in the actual text of the Gospel of St. Matthew. Thus we possess the proof that, almost the entire Gospel material was not purely oral tradition but written tradition, and written thirty years after the death of Jesus; and that the narratives which are regarded by certain critics at the present day as legends, were received from those who had played a part in them, and were collected, published and read in the Christian communities in which these eyewitnesses still lived. This it is which, humanly speaking, guarantees, if not the historicity of all the details, at least the substantial historicity of the Gospel.

APPENDIX II.

The First Martyrs of Gaul.

In the Chapter on the Church and Sanctity we said that they only were truly martyrs who knew how to suffer and die without ostentation, yet with such heroic simplicity that, having put all their hope in God, they died without other thought than that of preserving, protecting, and even of communicating to others the religious convictions to which, beyond all else, they were attached. The simple narrative of the sufferings and death of the first witnesses for the faith amongst the Gauls in the Seventeenth year of Marcus Aurelius (177 or 178 of the Christian Era), is so typical of the real state of the Martyr's spirit, that we cannot refrain from reproducing this incomparable page of the history of our fathers in the faith.

The narrative was written on the morrow of the event by an eyewitness, perhaps by St. Irenaeus himself, in the name of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, and was addressed by them to the Churches of Asia whence their Apostles had come. Eusebius has preserved long passages from this letter in his Ecclesiastical History. Bk. V., Ch. I and II. We give them in full.[1]

"*The servants of Christ dwelling*[2] *at Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul, to those brethren in Asia and Phrygia,*

[1] (We give the passages as they stand in the translation of the *Ecclesiastical History* by Rev. C. F. Cruse, M.A., London, 1838, supplementing them where necessary by the translation of the critical text of Eusebius, edited by Dr. Edward Schwartz. *Eusebius Werke,* Leipzig, 1908, t. ii, p. 412.)

[2] παροικοῦντες "having their lodging." This was the term used by the early Christians to show that they had no permanent abiding place in

having the same faith and hope with us (in the Redemption), peace and glory from God the Father, and Christ Jesus Our Lord."

"The greatness, indeed, of the tribulation, and the extent of the madness exhibited by the heathen against the Saints, and the sufferings which the martyrs endured in this country, we are not able fully to declare, nor is it, indeed, possible to describe them; for the adversary assailed us with his whole strength, giving us already a prelude, how unbridled his future movements among us would be. And, indeed, he resorted to every means, to accustom and exercise his own servants against those of God, so that we should not only be excluded from houses, and baths, and markets, but everything belonging to us was prohibited from appearing in any place whatever. But the grace of God contended for us, and rescued the weak, and prepared those who, like firm pillars, were able through patience, to sustain the whole weight of the enemy's violence against them. These coming in close conflict, endured every species of reproach and torture. Esteeming what was deemed great, but little, they hastened to Christ, showing in reality, "that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." And first, they nobly sustained all the evils that were heaped upon them by the populace, clamours, and blows, plundering and robberies, stonings and imprisonments, and whatsoever a savage people delight to inflict upon enemies. After this they were led to the forum, and when interrogated by the tribune, and the authorities of the city, in the presence of the multitude, they were shut up in prison until the arrival of the imperial legate. Afterwards, they were led away to be judged by him, from whom we endured all manner of cruelty. Vettius Epagathus, one of the brethren, who abounded

this world. Hence παροικία "a dwelling," used to signify the assemblage of sojourners, members of a Christian Community. Hence again *parochia*, paroisse, parish.

in the fulness of the love of God and man, and whose walk and conversation had been so scrupulously faithful though he was only young, shared in the same testimony with the elder Zacharias. He had walked, therefore, in all the commandments and righteousness of the Lord blameless, and with alacrity in kind offices to man, abounding in zeal for God, and fervent in spirit. As he was of this high character, he could not bear to see a judgment so unjustly passed against us, but gave vent to his indignation, and requested also, that he should be heard in defence of his brethren, whilst he ventured to assert that there was nothing either at variance with religion or piety among us. At this, those around the tribunal cried out against him, for he was a man of eminent standing. Nor did the governor allow a request so just and so properly made, but only asked whether he also were a Christian? He confessed in as clear a voice as possible, and he, too, was transferred to the number of martyrs, being publicly called the advocate of the Christians. But he had the Paraclete (advocate) within him, *viz.*, the Spirit that animated Zacharias, which, indeed, he displayed by the fulness of his love; glorying in the defence of his brethren, and to expose his own life for theirs. He was indeed, a genuine disciple of Christ, following the Lamb whithersoever he would go. After this, the others were also set apart, and the first martyrs endured their sufferings with promptness and alacrity, most cheerfully finishing the confession of martyrdom. Others appeared, indeed, unprepared and inexperienced, and so weak as to be incapable of bearing the intensity of the mighty contest. Of these, indeed, about ten fell away, causing great sorrow and grief to our brethren, and damping the ardour of those who had not yet been taken. These, however, although they endured all manner of affliction, nevertheless were always present with the martyrs, and never left them. Then, indeed, we were all struck with great

fear, on account of the uncertainty of their holding out in the profession, not indeed dreading the tortures inflicted, but looking to the end, and trembling lest they should apostatize. Those, indeed, that were worthy to fill up the number of the martyrs, were seized from day to day, so that all the zealous members of the two Churches, and those by whose exertions the Church had been there established (those who were our chief support here), were collected. Some domestics that were heathen, belonging to our brethren, were also seized, as the governor had publicly commanded search to be made for all of us. But these, at the instigation of Satan, fearing the tortures which they saw the Saints suffering and the soldiers beside this urging them, (falsely) charged us with feasts of Thyeste, and the incests of Aedipus, and such crimes as are neither lawful for us to speak nor to think; and, such, indeed, as we do not even believe were committed by men. These things being spread abroad among all the people, all were so savage in their treatment of us, that, if before some had restrained themselves on account of some affinity, they then carried their cruelty and rage against us to a great excess. Then was fulfilled the declaration of our Lord, "that the day would come when everyone that slayeth you will think he is doing God a service." The holy martyrs, after this, firmly endured tortures, beyond all description; Satan striving with all his power, that some blasphemy might be uttered by them. Most violently did the collective madness of the mob, the governor and the soldiers, rage against the holy deacon of Vienne, and against Maturus, a new convert indeed, but a noble champion of the faith. Also, against Attalus, a native of Pergamus, who was a pillar and foundation of the Church there. Against Blandina, also, in whom Christ made manifest, that the things that appear mean and deformed and contemptible among men, are esteemed of great glory with God, on account of love to him, which is really

and powerfully displayed, and glories not in mere appearance. For whilst we were all trembling, and her earthly mistress, who was herself one of the contending martyrs, was apprehensive lest through the weakness of the flesh, she would not be able to profess her faith with sufficient freedom, Blandina was filled with such power, that her ingenious tormentors who relieved and succeeded each other from morning till night, confessed that they were overcome, and had nothing more that they could inflict upon her. Only amazed that she still continued to breathe after her whole body was torn asunder and pierced, they gave their testimony that one single kind of the torture inflicted, was of itself sufficient to destroy life, without resorting to so many and such excruciating sufferings as these.

But this blessed Saint, as a noble wrestler, in the midst of her confession itself renewed her strength; and to repeat, "I am a Christian, no wickedness is carried on by us," was, to her, rest, refreshment and relief from pain. But Sanctus himself, also nobly sustaining beyond all measure and human power, the various torments devised by men, whilst the wicked tormentors hoped that by the continuance and the greatness of the tortures, they would get to hear something from him that he ought not to say, withstood them with so much firmness, that he did not even declare his name, nor that of his nation, nor the city whence he was, nor whether he was a slave or a freeman, but to all the questions that were proposed, he answered in the Roman tongue, "I am a Christian." For this he confessed instead of his name, his city, his race, and instead of everything. No other expression did the heathen hear from him. Whence, also, an ambitious struggle in torturing arose between the governor and the tormentors against him; so that when they had nothing further that they could inflict, they at last fastened red hot plates of brass to the most tender parts of his body. But he continued unsubdued and unshaken, firm in

his confession, refreshed and strengthened by the celestial fountain of living water that flows from Christ. But the corpse itself was evidence of his sufferings, as it was one continued wound, mangled and shrivelled, that had entirely lost the form of man to the external eye. Christ suffering in him exhibited wonders; defeating the adversary, and presenting a kind of model to the rest, that there is nothing terrific where the love of the Father, nothing painful where the glory of Christ prevails. For when the lawless tormentors tortured the martyr again during the day, and supposed that whilst the wounds were swollen and inflamed, if they applied the same torments, they would subdue him, as if he would not then be able to bear even the touch of the hand, or else, that dying under his torture he would strike a terror into the rest, not only was there no appearance like this, but, beyond all human expectation, the body raised itself, and stood erect amid the torments afterwards inflicted and recovered the former shape and habit of the limbs; so that his second tortures became, through the grace of Christ, not his torment but his cure. But the devil also led forth a certain Biblis, a woman, to punishment, who was one of those that had renounced the faith: thinking that he had already swallowed her, he was anxious to increase her condemnation by blasphemy, and constraining her as a frail and timid character, easily overpowered, to utter impieties against us. But in the midst of the torture she repented and recovered herself, and as if awakening out of a deep sleep, was reminded by the punishment before her, of the eternal punishment of hell. And accordingly she contradicted the blasphemers in her declarations. "How," said she, "could such as these devour children, who considered it unlawful even to taste the blood of irrational animals?" After that, she professed herself a Christian, and was added to the number of the martyrs. But as all the tortures of the tyrants were defeated by Christ, through the patience of the martyrs, the devil devised

other machinations; among these were their confinement in prison, in a dark and most dismal place; their feet also stretched in the stocks, and extended to the fifth hole, and other torments, which the enraged minions of wickedness, especially when stimulated by the influence of Satan, are accustomed to inflict upon the prisoners. Numbers of them were, therefore, suffocated in prison, as many, *viz.*, as the Lord would have to depart, thus showing forth his glory. Some of them, indeed, had been cruelly tormented, so that it appeared they could scarcely live, though every means were applied to recover them. Though confined in prison, devoid of all human aid, they were strengthened by the Lord, and filled with power from him both in body and mind, and even stimulated and encouraged the rest. But the new converts and those that were recently taken, whose bodies were not exercised in trials, did not bear the oppression of incarceration, but died within the prison.

But the blessed Pothinus, who had faithfully performed the ministrations of the Episcopate at Lyons, and who was past his ninetieth year, and very infirm in body ; who, indeed, scarcely drew his breath, so weak was he in body at the time ; yet in the ardour of his soul and his eager desire for martyrdom, he roused his remaining strength, and was himself also dragged to the tribunal. Though his body, indeed, was already nearly dissolved, partly by age and partly by disease, yet he still retained his life in him, that Christ might triumph by it. When carried by the soldiers to the tribunal, whither the public magistrates accompanied him, as if he were Christ himself and when all the mob raised every outcry against him, he gave a noble testimony. When interrogated by the governor, who was the God of the Christians, he said, "If thou art worthy, thou shalt know." After this, he was unmercifully dragged away and endured many stripes whilst those that were near abused him with their hands and feet in every possible way, not even

regarding his age. But those at a distance, whatsoever they had at hand, everyone hurled at him, all thinking it would be a great sin and impiety if they fell short of wanton abuse against him. For they supposed they would thus avenge their own gods. Thus, scarcely drawing breath, he was thrown into prison, and after two days he there expired. A wonderful interposition of God was then exhibited, and the boundless mercy of Christ clearly displayed a thing that had rarely happened among brethren, but by no means beyond the reach of the skill of Christ. For those that had fallen from the faith on the first seizure, were also themselves imprisoned, and shared in the sufferings of the rest. Their renunciation did them no good at this time, but those that confessed what they really were, were imprisoned as Christians; no other charge being alleged against them. But these, at last, were confined as murderers and guilty culprits, and were punished with twice the severity of the rest. The former, indeed, were refreshed by the joy of martyrdom, the hope of the promises, the love of Christ, and the Spirit of the Father; but the latter were sadly tormented by their own consciences. So that the difference was obvious to all in their very countenances, when they were led forth. Those went on joyful, much glory and grace being mixed in their faces, so that their bonds seemed to form noble ornaments, and, like those of a bride, adorned with various golden bracelets, and impregnated with the sweet odour of Christ, they appeared to some anointed with earthly perfumes; but the others, with downcast look, dejected, sad and covered with every kind of shame, in addition to this, were reproached by the heathen as mean and cowardly, bearing the charge of murderers, and losing the honourable, glorious, and life-giving appellation of Christians. The rest, however, seeing these effects, were so much the more confirmed, and those that were taken immediately, confessed, not even

admitting the thought suggested by diabolical objections.

After these things their martyrdom was finally distributed into various kinds; for plaiting and constituting one crown of various colours and all kinds of flowers, they offered it to the Father. It was right, indeed, that these noble wrestlers, who had sustained a diversified contest, and had come off with a glorious victory, should bear away the great crown of immortality. Maturus, therefore, and Sanctus, and Blandina, and Attalus, were led into the amphitheatre to the wild beasts, and to the common spectacle of heathenish inhumanity the day for exhibiting the fight with wild beasts being designedly published on our account. Maturus, however, and Sanctus, again passed through all the tortures in the amphitheatre, just as if they had suffered nothing at all before, or rather as those who in many trials before had defeated the adversary, and now contending for the Crown itself, again as they passed, bore the strokes of the scourge usually inflicted there, the draggings and lacerations from the beasts, and all that madness of the people, one here and another there, cried for and demanded; and last of all the iron chair, upon which their bodies were roasted, whilst the fumes of their own flesh ascended to annoy them. The tormentors did not cease even then, but continued to rage so much the more, intending, if possible, to conquer their perseverance. They could not, however, elicit or hear anything from Sanctus, besides that confession which he had uttered from the beginning.

These two, therefore, in whom life for the most part had remained through the mighty conflict, were at last dispatched. On that day, they were made an exhibition to the world, in place of the variety of gladiatorial combats. Blandina, however, was bound and suspended on a stake, and thus exposed as food to the assaults of wild beasts, and as she thus appeared to hang after the manner of the cross, by

her earnest prayers she infused much alacrity into the contending martyrs. For as they saw her in the contest, with the external eyes, through their sister they contemplated Him that was crucified for them, to persuade those that believe in Him, that every one who suffers for Christ, will for ever enjoy communion with the living God. But as none of the beasts then touched her, she was taken down from the stake, and remanded back again to prison to be reserved for another contest; so that by gaining the victory in many conflicts, she might render the condemnation of the wily serpent irrefragable, and though small and weak and contemptible, but yet clothed with the mighty and invincible wrestler Christ Jesus, might also encourage her brethren. Thus she overcame the enemy in many trials, and in the conflict received the crown of immortality. But Attalus himself, being vehemently demanded by the populace, as he was a distinguished character, came well prepared for the conflict conscious as he was of no evil done by him, and as one who had been truly exercised in Christian discipline, and had always been a witness of the truth with us. When led about in the theatre, with a tablet before him, on which was written in Latin, "This is Attalus the Christian," and the people were violently incensed against him, the governor learning that he was a Roman, ordered him to be remanded back again to prison with the rest, concerning whom he had written to Caesar, and was now awaiting his determination. But he (Attalus) in the meanwhile was neither idle nor unprofitable to them, but, by their patient endurance, the immeasurable mercy of Christ was manifested. For by means of those that were yet living, were things dead made to live. And the martyrs conferred benefits upon those that were no martyrs (*i.e.* upon those that had fallen away). Much joy was also created in the virgin mother, (the Church,) for those whom she had brought forth as dead she recovered again as living. For by means of these the greater

part of those that fell away, again retraced their steps, were again conceived, were again endowed with vital heat, and learned to make the confession of their faith. And now living again, and strengthened in their faith, they approached the tribunal, where that God that willeth not the death of the sinner, but inviteth all to repentance, sweetly regarding them, they were interrogated by the governor. For as Cæsar had written that they should be beheaded, but if any renounced the faith these should be dismissed; at the commencement of the fair which is held here, which indeed is attended by an immense concourse of people from all nations, the governor led forth the martyrs, exhibiting them as a show and public spectacle to the crowd. Wherefore, he also examined them again, and as many as appeared to have the Roman citizenship, these he beheaded. The rest he sent away to the wild beasts. But Christ was wonderfully glorified in those that had before renounced Him, as they then, contrary to all suspicion on the part of the Gentiles, confessed. And these indeed, were separately examined, as if they were soon to be dismissed; but as they confessed they were added to the number of the martyrs. Those, however, who had never any traces of the faith,[1] nor any conception of the marriage garment, nor any thought of the fear of God, remained without, who, as the sons of perdition, blasphemed the road (of life), by their apostacy. All the rest, however, were attached to the Church, of whom, when examined, a certain Alexander was found to be one, a Phrygian by birth, and physician by profession. Having passed many years in Gaul, and being well known for his love of God and his freedom in declaring the truth, for he was not destitute of Apostolical grace, he stood before the tribunal, and by signs encouraged them to a good

[1] *Note.*—This is not that speculative faith which they may have received the day of their baptism, but that full faith of which St. Paul frequently speaks, by which man gives to God in Christ, not only the adhesion of his intelligence but the consecration of his whole being, and which is the distinctive characteristic of the predestinate. (Père Hugueny, O.P.)

confession, appearing to those around the tribunal as one in the pains of childbirth. The mob, however, chagrined that those who had before renounced the faith were again confessing, cried out against Alexander, as if he had been the cause of this. And when the governor urged and asked him who he was, and he replied that he was a Christian, in his rage he condemned him to the wild beasts, and accordingly, on the following day, he entered the arena with Attalus. For the governor, to gratify the people, also gave up Attalus a second time to the beasts.

Thus, enduring all the torments that were invented as punishment in the amphitheatre, and after sustaining the arduous conflict, these were likewise finally despatched. As to Alexander, he neither uttered a groan nor any moaning sound at all, but in his heart communed with God; and Attalus, when placed upon the iron chair, and the fumes from his roasting body arose upon him, said to the multitude in Latin: "Lo, this is to devour men, what you are doing. But as to us, we neither devour men nor commit any other evil." And when he was asked what was the name of God, he answered, God has no name like a man. After all these, on the last day of the Shows of the gladiators, Blandina was again brought forth, together with Ponticus, a youth about fifteen years old. These were brought in every day to see the tortures of the rest. Force was also used to make them swear by their idols; and when they continued firm, and denied their pretended divinity, the multitude became outrageous to them, so that they neither compassionated the youth of the boy nor regarded the sex of the woman. Hence they subjected them to every horrible suffering, and led them through the whole round of torture, ever and anon striving to force them to swear, but were unable to effect it. Ponticus, indeed, encouraged by his sister, so that the heathen could see that she was encouraging and confirming him, nobly bore the whole of these sufferings, and gave up his life. But the

blessed Blandina last of all, as a noble mother that had animated her children, and sent them as victors to the great King, herself retracing the ground of all the conflicts her children had endured, hastened at last, with joy and exultation at the issue, to them, as if she were invited to a marriage feast, and not to be cast to wild beasts. And thus, after scourging, after exposure to the beasts, after roasting, she was finally thrown into a net and cast before a bull, and when she had been well tossed by the animal, and had now no longer any sense of what was done to her by reason of her firm hope, confidence, faith, and her communion with Christ, she too was despatched. Even the Gentiles confessed, that no woman among them had ever endured sufferings as many and great as these. But not even then was their madness and cruelty to the saints satisfied; for these fierce and barbarous tribes, stimulated by the savage beast Satan, were in a fury not easy to be assuaged, so that their abuse of the bodies assumed another novel and singular aspect. Not abashed when overcome by the martyrs, but evidently destitute of all reason, the madness both of the governor and the people, as of some savage beast, blazed forth so much the more, to exhibit the same hostility against us. That the Scriptures might be fulfilled. "He that is *unjust* let him be *unjust* still, and he that is righteous let him be righteous still" Rev. xxii. 11. For those that were suffocating in prison, they cast to the dogs, carefully watching them night and day, lest any should be buried by us, and then also cast away the remains left by the beasts and the fire, howsoever they had either been mangled or burnt. They also guarded the heads of the others, together with the trunks of their bodies, with military watches, for many days in succession, in order to prevent them from being buried. Some, indeed, raged and gnashed their teeth against them, anxious to find out some better way of punishment. Others, again, laughed at and insulted them, extolling their idols, and

imputing to them the punishment of the martyrs. But others, more moderate, and who in some measure appeared to sympathize, frequently upbraided them, saying, "Where is their God, and what benefit has their religion been to them, which they preferred to their own life?" Such was the variety of disposition among the Gentiles, but among our brethren, matters were in great affliction for want of liberty to commit the bodies to the earth. For neither did the night avail us for this purpose, nor had money any effect to persuade, nor could any prayers or entreaties move them. But they guarded them in every possible way, as if it were a great gain, to prevent them from burial.

. . . . . .

The bodies of the martyrs after being abused in every possible manner, and thus exposed to the open air for six days, were at length burned and reduced to ashes by the wretches, and finally cast into the Rhone that flows near at hand, that there might not be any vestige of them remaining on the land. These things they did as if they were able to overcome God, and destroy their resurrection. As they themselves gave out "that they might not have any hope of rising again, in the belief of which, they have introduced a new and strange religion, and contemn the most dreadful punishments, and are prepared to meet death ever with joy. Now we shall see, whether they will rise again; and whether their God is able to help them, and rescue them out of our hands."

. . . . . .

They were also zealous in the imitation of Christ, who, though in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, that though they were esteemed in the same light, and had neither once nor twice, but frequently, endured martyrdom, and had been again taken away from the beasts to prison, and had bands, and scars, and wounds spread over them, they did not proclaim themselves martyrs, for it did not become us to apply this name to them; but if any one of us, either by letter or in conversation,

called them martyrs, they seriously reproved us. For they cheerfully yielded the title of martyr to Christ, the true and faithful martyr (witness) the First-begotten from the dead, the Prince of divine life. They also made mention of those martyrs that had already departed, and said "They now are martyrs whom Christ has thought worthy to be received in their confession, setting the seal to their martyrdom (testimony), by the issue. But we are but indifferent and mean confessors, and with tears did they entreat the brethren, that they should offer up incessant prayers, that they might be made perfect. They exhibited, indeed, the power of martyrdom in fact, exercising much freedom in declaring themselves to all people, and manifested their noble patience and fearless intrepidity: but the name of the martyrs (witnesses) they declined receiving from the brethren, filled as they were with the fear of God."

. . . . . .

They humbled themselves under the mighty hand, by which they are now highly exalted. Then, however, they pleaded for all, they accused none, they absolved all, they bound none, and prayed for those that were so bitter in their hostility, like Stephen, that perfect martyr. 'Lord, impute not this sin to them.' But if he prayed for those that stoned him, how much more for the brethren.

. . . . . .

This was their greatest conflict against him (the devil), on account of the genuine character of their love, that the beast being choked and throttled might be forced to return alive again (to vomit up) those whom he had already thought to have swallowed. For they did not arrogate any superiority over the backsliders: but in those things wherein they themselves abounded, in this they supplied those that were deficient, exercising the compassion of mothers, and pouring forth many prayers to the Father on their account. They implored life, and he gave it to them, which they also shared with their

neighbours; coming off victorious over all, to God: always lovers of peace, they always recommended peace, and with peace they departed to God; not leaving grief to their mother (the Church) no discord or dissensions to the brethren, but joy and peace, unanimity and love.

Any comment upon these sublime pages would be out of place; but we subjoin the list of martyrs that the Hieronymian Martyrology has drawn up from the traditions of the Church of Lyons in the fourth century.[1]

"At Lyons in Gaul; forty-eight martyrs, to wit: Pothinus, Bishop; Zachary, Priest; Vittus, Macarius, Asclepiades, Silvius, Primus, Ulpius, Vital, Cominus, Octobres, Philemon, Geminus, Julia, Albinus, Grata, Potamia, Pampeia, Rodana, Biblis, Quartia, Maternus, Elpis.

"Those flung to the beasts are: Sanctus, the Deacon; Maturus, Attalus, Alexander, Ponticus, Blandina.

"Those who died in prison are: Aristus, Cornelius, Zosimus, Titus, Julius, Zoticus, Apollo, Geminian, Julia, Ansonia, Emilia, Jamnica, Pompeia, Domna, Amelia, Justa, Trophima, Antonia.

"All these servants of Christ received the crown in the reign of Marcus-Aurelius Antoninus."

And the following also: Vincent, Mina, Priscus, Sepaça, Hilary, Felix, Castula.

And again in the same city: Epagatius, Emilia, Donata.

God is wonderful in His Saints.

[1] Edition De Rossi-Duchesne, 1894, p. 73, *Les Martyrs*, by Dom. H. Leclercq, O. S. B., Vol. I. p. 106.

APPENDIX III.

The Eucharistic Miracle at Faverney (1608).

In the Chapter on Miracles we spoke of the cures effected at Lourdes, and referred to the Bollandists for the numerous miracles which, historically attested, have borne witness in every age to the divine power that energizes in the Catholic Church in a very special manner.

At the time of writing the chapter a Eucharistic Congress had assembled in the ancient Abbey of Faverney (Haute-Saône), in the Diocese of Besançon, for the Third Centenary of the miraculous preservation of the Sacred Host from fire in this Abbey, on the night of Whit-Monday, 26th May, 1608.

If ever an occurrence was carefully recorded, examined scrupulously, and historically attested it is this occurrence. Not only was it witnessed by thousands during thirty-three hours, but the official inquiry which the Archbishop of Besançon, Mgr. de Rye, ordered to be held at the time, obtained twenty-nine distinct accounts of the miracle between 29th May and 9th June, 1608, all of which were sworn to by 54 witnesses, of whom eight were religious of the Abbey, thirteen other ecclesiastics, twenty-eight laymen, and five women. These accounts were inserted in the Procés verbal.

The original manuscript was lost during the Revolution, together with a number of other documents from the Archiepiscopal Archives where it had been deposited. But we possess four authentic copies, the oldest of which was made between 1694 and 1700, at the request of Ferdinand Lampinet, Councillor of the Parliament of Besançon.

All the details given by the eyewitnesses have been carefully recorded in the account of the miracle published by Jean Boyvin, President of the Parliament of Dôle, in 1638, one of the most prominent figures in the history of Franche-Comté. We give his narrative as it stands.

***

"Near Bassigny and Lorraine in this province (of Franche-Comté), there is a little village named Faverney which possesses an ancient and celebrated Benedictine Abbey, whose Church is held in great veneration by the neighbouring people, on account of the numerous graces there received, through the intercession of the glorious Mother of God, to whom it is dedicated.

A sacristan of the Abbey anxious to stir up the devotion of the people, obtained a Brief from His Holiness about the year 1604, by which a number of indulgences were granted for a number of years to those who, having confessed and received Holy Communion, should visit this Church on the Feast of Pentecost, or on one of the two succeeding days: and, that all hearts might be drawn by what is greatest and most lovable in our Religion, the ancient custom of public Exposition of the Adorable Sacrament of the Eucharist, the true sign of the boundless love wherewith Jesus Christ has loved us, was revived.

On the eve of Pentecost, in the year of grace, sixteen hundred and eight, this same sacristan following his pious custom of preceding years, prepared an altar at the right-hand side of the choir door, in front of the iron screen dividing the Choir from the nave. The altar was placed on a platform which was raised on a step. Upon it there was placed a wooden Tabernacle supported by four pillars, adorned with silk, linen and woollen draperies, hung with garlands and other ornaments taken from the Sacristy or lent by the notabilities of the place. Within the Tabernacle there was an altar-stone fixed in a wooden frame and covered with a corporal upon

which the Sacred Body of Our Lord should be placed; and, in front of the Altar the parchment Brief of the indulgences granted by the Sovereign Pontiff, together with the letters of assent bearing the seal of the Ordinary of the diocese, were affixed. At Vespers, the Prior, who officiated in the absence of the Abbot, followed by all the monks, reverently carried the Most Holy Eucharist to the Altar already prepared for it, and placed in the Tabernacle the Sacred Monstrance containing two consecrated Hosts which had been reserved from the Conventual Mass that morning. The Monstrance was of silver gilt, the large base being divided into panels like that of a chalice. In the middle there was a crystal tube fixed lengthwise, with rings of silver gilt, and containing some bones of the finger of St. Agatha, Virgin and Martyr. This crystal was supported by two branches, springing bracket-like from the nodule at the base, and above it were two other smaller branches, in the midst of which was the lunette with its two glass, or crystal cases enclosing the two Hosts. There were two on account of the large size of the lunette, and that from both sides the image of the Crucifix, impressed upon each Host according to an old custom in the Monastery, might be seen. Crowning all was a small Cross with rounded, polished arms. The entire Monstrance weighed somewhat more than a mark or eight ounces Troy weight.

Thus prepared, and furnished with lights, the Chapel remained in this state during the following night and on the Feast itself which was solemnly observed by the people of the village and the neighbourhood who confessed, received Holy Communion, and made many visits to the Church.

In the evening, when the people had gone, the sacristan placed two glass lamps such as are ordinarily used in Churches, on the table of the Altar before the Blessed Sacrament. They were fixed in two tin sconces, and supplied with sufficient oil and

wick to burn during the night. Having closed the doors carefully, he left everything as on the preceding night under the sole but safe keeping of the ever watchful eye of God.

The following morning, Monday, 26th May, about three o'clock, when the Sacristan opened the doors of the Church—a large, well proportioned nave, —he found the building filled with smoke; and, turning his eyes at once towards the Chapel, he beheld only a dense cloud of smoke amidst which might be seen the burning *débris* of the ornaments. He was panic-stricken at the sight; but quickly recovering, he ran to summon assistance, crying out that the Church was on fire, and that all was lost. The other monks and some villagers came immediately, only to find that more than two-thirds of the table which served as an altar was burned where it touched the iron screen; that the step and tabernacle with its hangings were completely destroyed by the flames; and that all that remained was a portion of the dais upon which the Blessed Sacrament had been placed, and part of the Altar front with the Brief of Indulgences, and deed of assent which were untouched, except that the wax-seal of the Fisherman had run, and the parchment had been twisted by the heat, yet not so greatly as to prevent the writing being as fully legible in its entirety as formerly. On the part which remained of the table of the Altar was found one of the tin sconces, its lamp still full of oil but its wick extinguished: the other lamp was overturned, and the sconce in which it had been fixed was about a foot away.

Their excitement, and the thick smoke prevented those present from seeing where the Monstrance with its Precious Treasure was. They looked on the ground amongst the burning *débris* and ashes, and with the assistance of some other religious and the people, the Altar-stone was discovered, broken in three pieces and so hot that it could not be handled. The frame in which it had been placed was completely

destroyed by the fire: two copper chandeliers had fallen, one of which was broken in two. One of the tin sconces for the lamps had melted, the lamp itself was broken into fragments, while the large wooden door-sill of the screen, and another wooden pillar were half-burned away: but not a sign was there of the Monstrance. The religious were in a state of perplexity, filled with sorrow and accusing themselves of negligence in regard to so priceless a Treasure, when a novice of thirteen years of age who searched with the other monks, cried out that he had found what they were looking for, and showed them the Monstrance containing the two Sacred Hosts, hovering in the air quite unsupported, at the same height as it had been placed, but about the distance of a palm back on the Gospel side, and slightly inclined, so that it seemed to rest gently against a joint of the screen by the extremity of one of the arms of the Cross. There was a space between the screen and the rest of the Monstrance. At once they all fell upon their knees and adored God hidden beneath the visible species, praising Him, and thanking Him fervently for having wrought such a wonder.

The Prior and the monks were afraid to touch it, for they knew not how to do so: but they sent one of the monks to the Capuchin Fathers at Vesoul, about three leagues away, asking that some of them might be sent to behold the wonder and to give advice.

Two priests of this Order, remarkable for their learning, prudence and holiness, came to the Abbey, followed by a lay-brother and several notable people of Vesoul, both clergy and lay folk. They arrived at the hour of Vespers in the Church of Faverney, and beheld with no less consolation than amazement, this Monstrance which contained the thrice Sacred Body of Our Redeemer, upheld in the air by the hand of the Almighty alone. When they humbly adored it, they lighted several candles and torches that they

might examine the marvel more closely, and learn if there was any natural cause for it. They examined the Monstrance with discreet, but careful and scrupulous exactitude, going round and round, in the Choir and outside it. The more particular they were the more certain did they become that a miracle had been wrought; and acknowledged that the sacred vessel, the base of which was still covered with smouldering cinders and ashes, had no visible support, as the extremity of one of the arms of the Cross which alone touched the screen, appeared to be such support on account of some ashes of burned linen which was between them; but that these ashes could not possibly support the entire weight, since the point of contact was not more than that of a grain of barley, and the position of the vessel was altogether unnatural.

As nothing further was required to prove that a miracle had occurred than the authority and juridical approbation of the superiors, they advised the Prior and the other monks to acquaint the Archbishop of Besançon in whose diocese the occurrence had taken place, immediately, so that in his prudence he might order what he judged most fitting for God's glory and the edification of his flock. Meanwhile all the people of the place and the surrounding country, drawn by the report of so strange an occurrence, crowded near the Monstrance so eagerly as almost to overturn the screen, which, owing to the burning of the door-sill and lintel, was not very firm. When this occurred, the Religious wisely thinking that the miracle would only remain as long as He Who wrought it for our instruction was pleased that it should, hastened to place a box below the Monstrance, so that if it fell from the place where it was suspended it might be received reverently and gently. They placed a deal board on trestles, with a Missal covered with a corporal beneath the Monstrance, leaving between it and the Missal a space of four or five fingers, and left all

that remained of the altar where it was placed after the fire. They also erected barricades to prevent the people from crowding round irreverently. Whilst they were engaged in fixing this, two men arrived with a large, heavy piece of wood for the purpose, and through inadvertence they struck the screen very violently with it; yet, despite all these happenings the Sacred Vessel remained unmoved. The rest of the day and the night were passed in watching, praying, singing canticles, praises and other devout exercises. At daybreak the next morning, men and women began to arrive in thousands from all parts, of all ages and conditions to behold the continued marvel. Several priests brought their parishioners in pilgrimage, and these people, in their rustic curiosity and inconsiderate fervour, surged against the barricade and screen but without disturbing the Monstrance in the least, for it still remained immovable, while the people prepared themselves by the reception of the Sacraments, prayer and alms, and by other pious exercises to receive the graces that are bestowed on faithful souls through this mystery.

Between nine and ten o'clock in the morning when the parish priest of Menoux, near Faverney, was celebrating Mass at the High Altar for the devotion of his little flock which he had marched thither in procession, just as he was about to take the bread in his hands to consecrate, one of the candles which was burning before the miraculous Host outside the Choir, was extinguished without apparent cause. It was lighted again immediately, and was again extinguished. This happened thrice, as if to warn those present that another prodigy was about to occur. When the priest at the High Altar in the Choir, placed the Consecrated Host on the Corporal after the elevation, the Monstrance which everyone regarded so attentively, raised itself and then gently descended upon the Corporal which covered the Missal placed to receive it. At this sight, the people struck their breasts, tears flowed from every eye, and all exclaimed: Mercy! A miracle!

A miracle! All the people in the Church, and it was filled, joined in the cry, and each spoke to the other of the favour which God had so graciously deigned to confer upon them for the strengthening of their faith.

The monks of the Abbey and the Capuchin Fathers who were notified at once, came and contemplated with joy and profound adoration the Sacred burden which was resting on the Corporal, while they noticed with wonderment that the cinders and ashes lying on the base of the Monstrance had not been disturbed in the slightest manner, and that there was not the least stain of any kind on the smooth, white linen. They examined more freely than before the extremity of the little Cross which had appeared to be fixed in some way to the screen, but found that it was perfectly right, and that only some ashes of the burnt linen covered a part of it: this made them all the more certain that a striking miracle had been wrought. There was nothing more to be desired than the rigorous examination and judicial approbation of those whose duty it is to give authoritative judgment upon the mysteries of religion.

The Most Illustrious Lord, Monseigneur Ferdimand de Longuy de Rye, Archbishop of Besançon, in his capacity as Ordinary of the place, immediately sent his Procurator-General, his Fiscal Advocate, and his Secretary to the Abbey. They saw, touched, and handled the burnt remains: opened the lunette which so far no one had dared to touch, and removed the two Hosts which appeared whole, and in no way injured by the fire, except that they were tinged with the smoke and flames which had enveloped them. The relics of the chaste St. Agatha were likewise removed from the crystal tube, and they too were found to be quite uninjured by the flames. What was most remarkable, was that the small piece of paper closing one end of the tube, and which was half exposed, was preserved from the fire through its proximity to the living, impassible Body of its

Creator, and the relics of His Spouse the Virgin Martyr. These commissaries drew up a Procés-verbal of all they had seen, and with reference to the other occurrences, they examined forty-two respectable witnesses chosen from amongst the others who had beheld the same marvel. Each one affirmed separately, and under solemn oath the uniform truth of what I have told; and some testified further that, just before the Monstrance descended on the Corporal, they heard as it were the silvery sound of a little bell, as if in warning of what was about to happen.

The Archiepiscopal Council, to which several theologians from the religious Orders and ecclesiastics of Besançon, renowned for their learning, discretion and probity, were summoned, declared by a solemn decree on June 19th of the same year, that the occurrence was evidently miraculous, or rather that it was a series of miracles, wrought for the confusion of unbelievers and heretics, and for the consolation and utility of all people living in the faith of Our Holy Mother the Catholic Apostolic, Roman Church: and that in approving of it by his ordinary authority according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, the Most Reverend Prelate ought to have it published and known as such without delay in his Diocese. To this the wise Prelate agreed, and caused a summary of the matter, containing its abridged history, to be printed and widely circulated.

The promulgation of the fact made in such a prudent and religious manner, the narratives of several chronicles and other writers of the time who recorded it in their chronicles of various languages, and the evidence of the fact itself ought to have sufficed to gain credence for it, undying remembrance, and to have won upon even the most stubborn heretic. And hence I believe it will not be either vain or useless to have written at length on the subject, and to have noticed all the particulars so far as I have carefully and faithfully collected them,

from the Process of the Commissaries and the evidence of the witnesses, without any attempt at elegance. I have taken the facts from the Archives of the city of Dôle in which are preserved two authentic copies, the use of which, the magistrate has freely granted to me.[1]

We now give the letter of an eyewitness, Frederick Vuillard, in which he tells how on seeing the miracle he became a Catholic and abjured the errors of Protestantism in which he had been brought up by his parents who had been banished from Besançon for heresy. The letter was addressed to the Aldermen of Dôle. To make it more intelligible we have punctuated it,—the original has practically no punctuation marks,—and have interpreted in a few places expressions that were obscure.

Gentlemen,

I have learned from Doctor Jean Clerc, Advocate of the Parliament of Dôle, that their Highnesses Albert and Isabella have been pleased to give into your keeping one of the Sacred Hosts of the great miracle of Faverney, and that you are desirous of knowing of the great favour conferred upon me by God's mercy, through having been present at the said miracle, for which I shall ever be thankful, and that you wish to hear the particulars from me. I have no wish to hide them, the more so, that I can never cease from recounting the wonders of my God, but those especially which I can make redound to His honour and glory. Let me say then, and testify in all truth that, on May the twenty-sixth, 1608, when returning as usual from Presigny and Fouvans where I had business with Baron de Langue, about a league from my home at Montbelliard, I passed through Vesoul in the morning, where I found the people of the place excited, because, on the preceding night in the Abbey Church of

[1] This narrative disagrees in one point only with the original documents of the Procés-verbal of the inquiry. The writer, or his copiest gives forty-two instead of fifty-two as the number of witnesses examined. Every other detail is to be found in the documents.

Faverney a great miracle had taken place, and which still continued, so they assured me. At once I determined to satisfy my curiosity rather than my devotion, for I was a heretic at the time; so I went to the said place, Faverney, in the company of some thousands of the inhabitants of Vesoul and the neighbourhood who had come there when they heard of the miracle. When I arrived, I drew near a place in the aforesaid Church which separates the Choir from the nave by a strong iron trellis-work, on which I saw the signs of a great fire, and cinders and ashes lying about, and the remains of a wooden Altar which, they told me, had been prepared the previous day for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, and which had been partially burned. Amid all these signs and remains of a great conflagration, I beheld a silver Monstrance, with gilt mouldings and extremities, resting in the air without any support of any kind, a sight which made me tremble, though I was a heretic. I refused to believe my eyes, so that I left the Church, coming back again and again full thirty times to see, and if possible to find some explanation of, the miracle. At length, having besought God to give me grace to have my faith enlightened, I began to consider that the Monstrance could not naturally remain in the air except by some supernatural cause, for it must fall, being of the weight of about a mark, and I knew this well, for I was a goldsmith by profession. And I grew still more astonished when the aforesaid Monstrance and the Blessed Sacrament, with the relics enclosed in the Monstrance, and the papers which closed the crystal tube in which were the relics of the finger of St. Agatha, Martyr, were not burned, since I saw around me broken marble, one of the tin chandeliers partially melted, and the aforementioned trellis all whitened through being burnt by the great heat of the fire. Moreover, that the canopy which covered the Altar was not burned above or around the Blessed Sacrament, and that the parchment containing the Bulls and indulgences, though covered with

ashes, were in no wise burned, except that the wax seal was melted. Considering these things, I could not remain unmoved, and believed what my religion had forbidden me to believe, so that, I knelt down to adore God Whom I beheld in the air overcoming the flames, and I prayed that He would give me grace to be freed one day from all my errors, and that on my part I would use all the strength, watchfulness and care that was necessary. This grace in His infinite Mercy, God, in hearing my prayer, bestowed on me. For I have never ceased since to learn what I could concerning the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman faith,—about which I believe I should never have troubled to learn, if God had not roused me by this spectacle—from secular priests as well as religious, Capuchins, Jesuits and others, so that, about four years later, I abjured all heresy and made my profession of the Catholic faith at Besançon before the Reverend Father Penitentiary, after having had all my doubts and errors sufficiently settled through the instructions given me during several days by the Reverend Father Peter Marius of the Society of Jesus, at that time Rector of the College of Pourentruy. And since then, neither I, nor the aforesaid Reverend Father when residing in the place, have ceased to exhort my wife and family to follow suit, which favour also God has been pleased to grant, so that, I left Montbelliard for Delle in Ferrette, which is subject to the Most Noble and Catholic House of Austria, and this about a year ago. I thank my God for having given me such grace, that, when several people heard me speak of this great miracle in all its details, some were greatly disturbed and embarrassed, not knowing any longer if they were Catholics or Protestants; others were converted, my mother, who is now dead, being amongst them, to whom God showed such mercy that, when I told her a short time before her death that I was a Catholic, and expected a rebuff, the contrary happened. For, when she heard the reasons for my conversion, she burst into

tears, embraced me joyfully, sorrowing that she had not been able to work out her salvation as she would have desired if she had not been married a second time; and dying in such peace, having wished for a Confessor to be with her, that God must have shown mercy. Since then, my brother became a convert and made public profession, together with a heretical woman from Franquentalle, at Pourentruy. I pray God to touch other heretics in the same way, that they may bless and praise Him for ever. I conscientiously assert the truth of all I have written, and I ask God to give me the grace of perseverance in the Faith until the end, and to continue His graces towards you. For this I pray without ceasing. I ask you, Gentlemen, to believe me ever.

Your humble servant,
FREDERIC VUILLARD.

BELFORT, *this 26th of June, 1619.*

ADDRESS:—Messieurs, The Viscount Mayor, Council and Aldermen of the City of Dôle.

May God bestow the same grace on the unbelieving reader.

PRINTED AT THE
EDINBURGH PRESS
300, BOWBAZAR STREET
CALCUTTA

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX.

Only those works are mentioned which we have consulted ourselves.

I.—Collection of Texts.

Denzinger.—*Enchiridion Symbolorum, definitionum, et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum.* Editio 9a aucta et emendata ab J. Stahl, Freiburg-im-Breisgau. Herder, 1900. (Editio XIa. Bannwart, S. J. Herder, 1911.)

O. von Gebhart, Harnack and Th. Zahn.—*Patrum Apostolicorum opera.* 4 fasc. in 8vo. Leipzig. Hinrichs, 1891.

Migne.—*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca.* (P.G.) and *Series Latina* (P.L.). Paris, 1857 *sq.*

Schwartz.—*Eusebius Werke.* IIe *Vol. Die Kirchengeschichte.* Greek text with Rufin's Latin translation, collated by Theodor Mommsen. Leipzig. Hinrichs, 1908.

II.—Encyclopedias.

A. Vacant and E. Mangenot.—*Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.* 3 vols.

J. Hastings.—*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.* 2 vols. Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1906.

A. Hauck.—*Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Théologie und Kirche.* Leipzig. Hinrichs, 1908.

Pauly Wissowa.—*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* (The Catholic Encyclopedia in Fifteen volumes. New York, 1907—12.)

III.—Other Works.

P. Allard.—*Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain de Néron à Théodose.* Paris, Lecoffre, 1903.

D. Bannesius.—*Scholastica Commentaria in primam partem Angelici Doctoris et in secundam secundae.* (q. I—XLVI.) 3 vols. Venetiis, 1587.

O. Bardenhewer.—*Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur.* Freiburg-im-Breisgau. Herder, 1902-03.

P. Battifol.—*L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme.* Paris, Gabalda, 1908.

G. Bertrin.—*Histoire Critique des Evénements de Lourdes. Apparitions et Guérisons.* 23e mille. Paris, Gabalda, 1908.

Broglie (Abbe de).—*Problèmes et conclusions de l'histoire des religions.* Paris, Putois-Cretté, 1897.

P. Bureau.—*La Crise morale des temps nouveaux.* 3e edition. Paris, Bloud et Cie, 1908.

Cajetanus, O. P. (Cardinalis Thomas de Vio).—*Commentaria in Summam Theologicam S. Thomae.* Editio Leonina.

Calmet (Dom. A.).—*Commentaire littéral sur tous les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament.* Le Prophète Isäie. Paris, Emery, 1714.

A. Condamin, S. J.—*Le Livre d'Isäie.* Traduction critique avec notes et commentaires. Collection des Etudes Bibliques. Paris, Lecoffre, 1905.

Chantepie de la Saussaye.—*Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte.* 2 vols., 2nd Ed. Freiburg-im-Breisgau. Mohr, 1897.

Fr. Cumont.—*Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra, publiés avec une introduction critique.* 2 vols. Brussels. Lamentin, 1899.

P. Decharme.—*Mythologie de la Grèce antique.* 2nd Edition. Paris. Garnier, 1886.

R. Dosy.—*Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme.* trad. Victor Chauvin. 2 vols. Paris, Maisonneuve, 1879.

L. Duchesne (Mgr.)—*Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise.* Paris, Fontemoing, 1907. Eng. Translation. *Early History of the Christian Church.* London, 1910.

L. Duchesne (Mgr.).—*Les Eglises séparées.* Paris, Fontemoing, 1905. *The Churches separated from Rome.* London, Kegan Paul, 1907.

A. Dufourcq.—*Histoire comparée des religions païennes et de la religion juive.* 3e Edition. Paris. Bloud, 1908.

V. Duruy.—*Histoire des Romains depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la mort de Théodose.* 2e Edition. Paris, Hachette, 1885. Eng. trans.

C. Fouard.—*La Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ.* 2 vols. 2e Edition. Paris, Lecoffre, 1882. Eng. trans.

J. B. Franzelin (Cardinal), S. J.—*Tractatus de divina Traditione et Scriptura.* 2e Edition. Rome, 1875.

A. Gardeil, O. P.—*La Crédibilité et l'Apologétique.* Paris, Gabalda, 1908.

P. Girad.—*L'Asclepieion d'Athènes d'après de récentes découvertes. Bibliothèque des Ecoles Francaises d'Athènes et de Rome.* Paris. Thorin, 1882.

G. Goyau.—*Vieille France et jeune Allemagne.* Paris, Perrin, 1903.

Ch. Guignebert.—*Manuel d'histoire ancienne du Christianisme. Les Origines.* Paris, Picard, 1906. (Hist. anc. du Chr.).

Ch. Guignebert.—*Modernisme et tradition Catholique en France.* Paris, 1908. (Mod. et trad.).

A. Harnack.—*Die Apostelgeschichte.* Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1908.

A. Harnack.—*Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius.* 3 vols., 1897.

A. Harnack.—*Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums der ersten drei Jahrhunderten.* 1st Edition, 1906.

A. HARNACK.—*Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte,* 1906. Eng. trans. *Luke the Physician.* London, 1909.

A. HARNACK.—*What is Christianity?*

E. HUGON, O. P.—*Hors de l'Eglise point de salut.* Paris, Lethielleux, 1907.

A. JAUSSEN, O. P.—*Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab.* Paris, Gabalda, 1908.

JOANNES a. S. THOMA, O .P.—*Cursus theologicus in Summam Theologicam. S. Thomae.* 10 vols. Paris, Vivés, 1886.

E. JACQUIER.—*Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament.* 4 vols. Paris, Gabalda, 1904—1908.

H. KERN.—*Histoire du Boudhisme dans l'Inde.* traduit du Neerlandais par Gedeon Huet. 3 vols. Paris, Leroux, 1903.

I. KNABENBAUER, S. J.—*Commentarius in Quatuor. S. Evangelia.* 4 vols. Paris, Lethielleux.

A. KROSE, S. J.—*Katholische Missionsstatistik, mit einer Darstellung des Gegenwärtigen Standes der Katholischen Heidenmission.* Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Herder, 1908.

M.-I. LAGRANGE, O. P.—*Le Messianisme chez les Iuifs de l'an 150, av. J. Ch. à 200 après J. Ch.* Paris, Gabalda, 1908.

E. LAVISSE ET A. RAMBAUD.—*Histoire générale du IVe siécle à nos jours.* 12 vols. Paris, Colin, 1893—1904.

A. LE ROY (MGR.).—*La Religion des Primitifs.* Paris, Beauchesne et Cie, 1909.

E. LE ROY.—*Dogme et Critique.* Paris, Bloud et Cie, 1907.

A. LOISY.—*L'Evangile et l'Eglise.* Paris, Picard, 1902.

A. LOISY.—*Autour d'un petit livre.* Picard, 1903.

A. LOISY.—*Le Quatrième Evangile.* Picard, 1903.

A. LOISY.—*Les Evangiles Synoptiques.* 2 vols. Celfonds (Haute-Marne), 1908.

C. MAZELLA (CARDINALIS), S. J.—*De Virtutibus infusis.* 3a Editio. Rome, 1884.

MIGNE.—*Les livres sacrés de toutes les religions sauf la Bible* 2 vols. Paris, 1865.

L. DE MILLOUE.—*Bod-Youl ou Tibet.* Paris, Leroux, 1906.

H. OLDENBERG.—*Le Boudha, sa vie, sa doctrine, sa communauté.* traduit de l'Allemand par A. Foucher. 6e Edition Francaise. Paris, Alcan, 1903.

PASCAL.—*Pensées.* Edition E. Havet. (*Thoughts of Pascal.*) Translated and edited by Chas. S. Jerram, M.A. Methuen and Co., London, 1901.

PLATO.—*La République. Dialogues Socratiques.* Traduction Chauvet et Saisset. 3 vols. Paris, Charpentier, 1862. (*The Republic.* Jowett's translation. Oxford.)

E. RENAN.—*Les Apôtres.* Paris,Calmann-Levy, 1866. (*The Apostles.* Translated by W. G. Hutchinson, London, 1905.)

E. RENAN.—*L'Eglise Chrétienne.* 3e Edition. Paris, Calmann-Levy, 1866.

E. Renan.—*Marc-Aurèle.* 5e Edition. *Ibd.* 1884. (*Marcus Aurelius.* Translated, with an Introduction, by William G. Hutchinson. London, 1903.)

Ch. Renouvier.—*Philosophie analytique de l'histoire,* 4 vols. Paris, Leroux, 1896-1897.

V. Rose.—*Evangile selon Saint Luc.* Traduction et Commentaire. Paris, Bloud et Cie, 1904.

Salmanticenses.—*Collegii Salmanticensis curses Theologicus* 20 vols. Paris, Palmé, 1870—1884.

Sanday and Headlam.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* 2nd Edition, Edinburgh, Clark, 1896.

G. Semeria.—*Dogma. Gerarchia e Culto nella Chiesa primitiva.* Roma, Pustet, 1902.

M. Schwab.—*Le Talmud de Jérusalem.* Trad. Francaise avec Introduction, notes et tables. II. vols. Paris, Maisonneuve, 1871—1890.

Fr. Suaresius.—*De triplici virtute Theologica.* In-folio. Paris, 1521.

S. Thomae.—*Opera Omnia.* 34 vols. Paris, Vivés, 1880.

J. Tixeront.—*La Théologie Anténicéenne.* Paris, Lecoffre, 1903.

P. Thureau-Dangin.—*La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIXe siécle.* 3 vols. Paris, Plon-Nourrit, 1899.

109966